

Birla Central Library

PILANI (Rajasthan)

Class No. 104

Book No. G 65P

Accession No. 38179

THE PHILOSOPHY OF A SCIENTIST

1977

THE PHILOSOPHY OF A SCIENTIST'

by

R. G. GORDON

M.D., D.Sc., F.R.C.P.Ed.

HUTCHINSON'S
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS

London New York Melbourne Sydney Cape Town

*Printed in Great Britain at
The Fleet Street Press
East Harding St., EC4*

CONTENTS

Preface	<i>Page</i> vii
<i>Chapter</i> i The Significance of Individual Life	9
ii Man's Philosophy of Life	20
iii The Sentiment of the Love of God	30
iv The Impulse to Perform the Will of God	38
v Truth, Beauty and Goodness	47
vi The Progress to Harmony	61
vii Happiness and Deity	76
viii The Proof of Progress	89
ix Service by the State	102
x The Goal of Progress	119
xi Values	130
xii The Quality of Deity	142
xiii Humanity and Deity	156
xiv Approach to Deity	169
xv The Individual Soul	180
xvi Immortal Life	194
Index	201

P R E F A C E

NEARLY twenty years ago, the author wrote a book in which he tried to construct a picture of the individual personality—the whole composition of the subject from every point of view. Since then, knowledge of the material side of the personality has increased enormously and we are beginning to have a much more clear impression of a coherent whole.

In the last chapter of the book referred to, a very tentative effort was made to attach some sort of meaning to the spiritual side of personality. The author received many kind letters asking him to expand and amplify this chapter, but the practical demand of a very busy life made it impossible to undertake such a task. During four recent years, however, with the complete uprooting consequent upon the war, there have been periods when a considerable amount of unoccupied time had to be employed. This seemed to afford an opportunity to piece together the somewhat nebulous ideas, which have been simmering for all these intervening years. The result is the present volume for what it is worth.

It is realized that many of the ideas and theories presented in this book have been formulated and thoroughly worked out by others, but probably in these days it is only the personal presentation of existing theory that can lay any claim to originality.

There is a certain repetition of the argument throughout the book, but an effort has been made to work it out, both from the standpoint of the individual personality and from the standpoint of the race, since the argument is based on the conception of Holism and the impossibility of separating the individual from his environment.

There has been too much tendency in the recent past to analyse and discriminate. In this book integration is stressed, even to the extent of merging the demands of self and race, or as Bridges calls it "breed." Also there is an attempt to consider the human soul in terms of the "idea" rather than the "thing"; in terms of value rather than of use. Only in this way does it seem possible to conceive of a soul at all, especially if it is to be at once individual, universal and immortal, for most people can no longer accept the doctrine of bodily resurrection, as taught by the early church.

To many, such a conception may appear inadequate and that on such terms life is not worth living, but this way leads to pessimism and the degeneration of mankind, whereas, it is submitted, man is not made that way. Man from his earliest childhood has seen the "Star in the East" which he needs must follow. Once he can learn to think in terms of values and not of things, in terms of the abstract rather than the concrete, he will realize not only that the star is really there, but that it is well worth following.

R. G. G.

BATH, 1947

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INDIVIDUAL LIFE

The Definition of Soul

From the time of the Ancient Greeks the significant part of the individual human being has been held to be the soul. The body was regarded as a mere temporary shell which held the soul. This soul somehow or other extended beyond the body in space and endured beyond the body in time. It was supposed to be immortal, however many changes it might undergo or wherever it might be located. This immortality naturally endowed it with more significance than belonged to the temporal body. Yet we can hardly think of the soul as anything but an attribute of the individual.

Many have thought that this conception of the extensive soul was nothing but an aspiration, in modern parlance "wishful thinking"; that the frustrations and limitations of life were such that man had to construct for himself a promise of something beyond, or he would sink into a slough of despond, that he would give up the struggle altogether, and perforce, having no further inducement to live, either as an individual or a race, would sink into death before his time.

This materialistic view is largely based on the evidence, or rather the want of evidence, of science which cannot demonstrate anything which we can call a soul in time and space. Yet can we believe that this idea of the existence of the soul, which has been so widely held throughout the ages, is entirely lacking in substance? Even to dismiss it as non-existent is quite unconvincing, for dreams are real enough; they have existence; though perhaps not fixed in time and space. We may have to envisage the soul not as a "thing" but as an abstraction, and abstractions may be even more important than particulars; the song of the nightingale is significant, not the song of the particular nightingale.

"The voice I hear this passing night was heard
 In ancient days by emperor and clown;
 Perhaps the self-same song that found a path
 Through the sad heart of Ruth, when, sick for home,
 She stood in tears amid the alien corn;
 The star that oft-times hath
 Charm'd magic casements, opening on the foam
 Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn."¹

Therefore to say that no one has been able to demonstrate the soul does not imply that no soul exists, for perhaps we have not looked in

¹ J. Keats: *Ode to a Nightingale*.

the right direction. Our ancestors tried to find it by dissection, to discover it amongst the parts of the body; the liver, the heart, the brain; now we are beginning to think in terms of the whole; perhaps the soul belongs to the wood rather than to the tree, the whole rather than the part.

“Do you think that you know the nature of the soul
Intelligently without knowing the nature of the whole?”¹

To say that because we cannot define the soul, or that we cannot define it in terms of time and space, is certainly not a proof of its non-existence, for who can define Beauty exactly, yet no one will deny the existence of Beauty.

“We swear that Beauty lives though lilies die.”²

The Purpose of this Book is to find a more satisfactory definition of Soul

It is the purpose of this book to consider exactly what is this significant part of the individual, call it the soul if it please you; to suggest that it can only be apprehended, dimly perhaps, but apprehended in some measure, if we go beyond the limiting barriers of time and space; to suggest that we shall not find it by dissection, by searching amongst the parts, but only by considering the whole; to suggest that we shall not find it in terms of things seen, things measured, but only by considering values, qualities and suchlike difficult and ephemeral realms of discourse; to suggest that we cannot find it within the strict limits of one individual only but in the relationships of individuals with their whole environment; but to suggest that having searched in these realms and discarded the limitations of our more familiar fields of inquiry, we shall find something, if we still must use the word “thing,” of the utmost value, which lasts throughout the ages, which is immortal, which has at once individual and universal significance.

If we define the soul as the significant part of the individual then by definition there must be a certain significance in what we call a soul to allow it to be dignified by that name. This is the basis for the claim that only human beings have souls for it is only man who is sufficiently differentiated from his fellows and has sufficiently complex relationships with his surroundings to be of real significance in the universe, if, of course, it is admitted that man is of importance in the universe. But it is the argument of this book that the quality of humanity is all-important in the evolution of values. (*cf.* Chapter XIII).

We may believe that all of us transcend our mortal selves and like the poets:—

“Ye have left your souls on earth!
Ye have souls in heaven too,
Double-lived in regions new!”³

¹ Plato: *Phaedrus*.

² J. E. Flecker: *The Golden Journey to Samarkand*.

³ J. Keats: *Ode on the Poets*.

We are part of the universe and only by thinking of ourselves as part of that universe, can we discover our own individual souls.

"He is one with nature; there is heard
 His voice in all her music, from the moan
 Of thunder, to the song of night's sweet bird;
 He is a presence to be felt and known
 In darkness and in light, from herb and stone,
 Spreading itself, where'er that power may move
 Which has withdrawn his being to its own;
 Which wields the world with never wearied love,
 Sustains it from beneath, and kindles it above.
 He is a portion of the loveliness
 Which once he made more lovely; he doth bear
 His part, while the one spirit's plastic stress
 Sweeps through the dull dense world, compelling there,
 All new successions to the forms they wear,
 Torturing the unwilling dress, that checks its flight
 To its own likeness as each mass they bear
 And bursting in its beauty and its might,
 From trees and beasts and men, into the heaven's light."

Constituents of the Soul

If the soul is the significant aspect of the individual we cannot understand the full meaning of man's soul without considering his body and the relationships which underlie what we call mind. So before discussing this soul it is necessary to consider, at least briefly, what is the individual himself. In a previous volume² the author sought to describe one of the meanings of the word "Personality" as recorded in the Oxford Dictionary. This is, the whole of the individual in all his aspects, and this may indeed be synonymous with his soul.

This personality is the start of our present inquiry and it is determined by many factors. It is not only body nor only mind, for these two cannot really be separated:

"Mind is the body thinking itself, body is the mind in extension."³
 But the personality is more even than this. Man has something to give to the universe and the universe has something to give to him.⁴

¹ P. B. Shelley: *Adonais*.

² R. G. Gordon: *Personality* (Kegan Paul, 1925).

³ Lessing.

⁴ cf. R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, I, 402-410.

"I wonder'd finding only my own thought of myself,
 and reading there that man was made in God's image
 knew not yet that God was made in the image of man;
 nor the profounder truth that both these truths are one,
 no quibbling scoff—for surely as mind in man groweth
 so with his manhood groweth his idea of God,
 wider ever and worthier, untill it may contain
 and reconcile in reason all wisdom passion and love,
 and bring at last (may God so grant) Christ's Peace on Earth."

It follows, therefore, that to understand personality, man must be studied and the universe must be studied, but it may be as well to start with the individual human man in his corporeal shape. The body in its framework of space and time, is described in terms of physics, chemistry, anatomy and physiology; the soul in its realm of values is described more in terms of philosophy and metaphysics, though psychology may in some sense be a link between the two.

Hereditary Factors

Each individual is unique, yet each resembles his fellows in many respects and we must study the explanation of these differences and resemblances, for only in this way can we understand that every soul is unique and yet closely related to other souls. First we must consider the germ plasm, from which the individual is derived and from which he acquires his hereditary characteristics. At once we find a difficult and complicated state of affairs. The germ plasm is not affected by the accidents and events which occur during the individual life. Although certain experiments suggest that acquired characters may be transmitted, they are not sufficiently convincing seriously to upset Weismann's theory that they are not transmitted. Set aside at a very early age of existence even before the individual is born, it is only altered during life by the most exceptional circumstances. It is the basis of the unification of life and the inter-relationship of individuals. Its function is to divide and produce the individual and again create the male and female cells which will carry on the race to the next generation. The germ cells contain the chromosomes and the genes which determine the hereditary characteristics which will be handed down to the representative of each generation. We do not know what these hereditary units, the genes, actually are, we do not know exactly why some individuals are male and others female, although we may be approaching that knowledge, since we know that the male and the female have a different arrangement of X and Y chromosomes in their germ cells, the presence of the Y chromosomes being necessary for maleness. Certainly we cannot foretell, still less decide, which sex an unborn baby will be, but we know that by the union of these cells both the differences and resemblances of individuals are determined.

Yet, in spite of this constancy in the germ plasm, in spite of its resistance to the effects of events happening to the body, there is a great difference between the offspring of even one mating pair. This is due to the fact that it does require two mates to produce one offspring and that the characteristics of this offspring are to some extent a mixture of those of the parents, and each parent is a mixture of his or her parents and so on.

We are now beginning to understand the laws which govern the transmission of these hereditary characteristics and variations between individuals; these can be studied in the technical books on genetics and

allied subjects and need not detain us here. It should be remembered, however, that variations of species as a whole take a very long time to establish, far longer than can be observed even during the whole of our recorded history. Although individuals differ, any group of individuals present very much the same characteristics. It is unlikely that there is any very evident difference between the men and women who lived a thousand years ago, in the time of the Saxon kings, and those who are alive at the present day. We may reflect that although we may seem very different in appearance when we look at each other, we see very little difference between the individual members of a flock of sheep. It is probable that a crowd of human beings would appear just as homogenous from the ovine point of view!

Variations—Mutations

Though there is not much change to be observed from generation to generation, the animal kingdom has changed in structure and function in the course of evolution as the direct result of hereditary variations, which we call "mutations"—the sudden appreciable changes which crop up from time to time, on which natural selection works. This change took long ages, measured in millions of years, during which those who were better adapted to their environment survived, and those who were less well adapted died out. No doubt, to begin with, the human race, which has only been in existence for a very short period, as measured in geological time, changed by the same means. But even if we allow that the human race has existed for 340,000 years¹, a long time by our measurements, this is not long enough to produce the marked changes, especially in culture, which have taken place since the dawn of human life, solely by the methods which we believe have been operative in changing the animal kingdom.

Social Heritage

We must remember, however, that human change, especially in its mental and cultural characteristics, is not only brought about by the slow alteration in hereditary factors determined by natural selection, but also by what we call social heritage. Social heritage is the tradition handed down from one generation to another. This is not inherent, but is relearnt by each successive generation. By its means even structure may be apparently modified. For example, the Martian observer might conclude that the small or "lily" feet of Chinese women was an hereditary peculiarity, since until recently the deformity was practically universal. Yet we know that this peculiar structure of the feet is not found in the adult Chinese woman, unless each separate child has had its feet bound up in the particular way by which the deformity is produced.

Artificial selection can produce a more rapid and far-reaching change than can natural selection, if the influence of artificial selection is

¹ G. Childe: *Man makes Himself*.

continued over a period of several generations under the dictates of tradition or authority. The deliberate killing of weakly infants, for example, was practised by the highly civilized Spartans with the definite purpose of modifying their race and in this they no doubt succeeded. This change, which possibly did not persist once the practice had ceased, certainly produced a temporary alteration in the direction of improved physique and more virile disposition far more rapidly and effectively than natural selection could ever have done. The Nazis set out to do the same sort of thing in our own times, but fortunately their practices will not be allowed to be carried on for sufficiently long for them to have any lasting effect. Social heritage and artificial selection are two-edged weapons capable of much good and of much harm, according to the wisdom or unwisdom of those who direct them, but it is only the human race with its developed mind which can modify its own form by these means.

The human being owes many of his characteristics to his heredity, much of his structure, many of his tendencies towards health or disease, much of his behaviour, probably many of his tastes. Heredity also determines many of his mental traits as well as his physical appearance, but we must beware of attributing too much to this cause. Many apparently hereditary characteristics are really the result of social heritage and this social heritage is at least to some extent under the direction of human will.

"Hitherto evolution has been unconscious. . . . But now, for the first time in all the millions of years in the earth's history, there exists a race of beings on the planet, who have grasped something of the evolutionary process which governs the cosmos: looking backward and forward, they are able to see themselves as factors in the process, able in a measure to guide it."¹

The possibilities of this direction of man's evolution by himself are very far-reaching.

"The mind of a human being constantly organizes itself and its own world apart from the processes, which for the most part control the body within which, and (at first) as a function of which, the mind has come into being. As mind increasingly takes control of the organism, so it becomes increasingly independent of the organism as physiologically conceived. . . . The greater the capacity for concentration of attention, the more complex does this detachment become; but every person who is ever conscious of obligation illustrates the vital principles of it. For obligation is not a calculation of the interests of the organism and of the way to serve these; it is an appreciation of value so distinct as to demand the sacrifice of all other interests for its sake. The mind which has achieved this is detached from the 'whole might of nature.' Duty and freedom have visited it together, for these are, as Kant perceived, inseparably correlated with one another."²

¹ Lord Samuel: *Belief and Action*.

² W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 467.

Man's Brain

All this advance of the human race and man's power of modifying himself by artificial selection has depended on the remarkable development of his brain, a development which chiefly distinguishes him from the rest of the animal kingdom. We are reasonably safe in saying, no brain, no mind; no mind, no personality; no personality, no soul.

With the growth of brain came the power of speech, the power of transmitting ideas, of teaching and of learning. It has been said that the human being is the only animal who asks questions, who wants to know the reason why, and he goes on asking till he gets an answer. Froude, in a delightful essay, *The Cat's Pilgrimage*, describes how the cat visits the other animals in a vain quest to find out what it all means, but the rest are not interested and the cat, having obtained no satisfactory answer, soon gives it up and returns to its fireside and its milk. Not so the human, the fireside and the bowl of milk are not enough. So by asking why and forever seeking the answer which escapes him, he has increased and widened the power of his social heritage, till it far outweighs his heredity in moulding his life, his habits and his tastes.

His powers of receiving and handing on this social heritage depend on the structure and function of his body and especially of his brain on which depends his mind. Except for his brain, man does not excel the other animals. He is surpassed by many in such qualities as fleetness of foot, strength of muscles, keenness of hearing and sight, power of endurance without food and drink and so on and so on; indeed in only one respect does he surpass them all and that is in his mental development, which gives him his adaptability, by means of which he has conquered the earth, and which perhaps entitles him to claim that he has a soul. So far as we know by observation, the animals have considerable powers within the dimensions of space, but very little within the dimensions of time. Their memory is short and restricted, though they can apparently remember places and people and in some measure events. Actually such phenomena as the power of cats and dogs to find their way home from long distances, may not depend on memory as we know it. Again the full explanation of the migratory habits of birds still escapes us. Man, on the other hand, can range through the past to an almost unlimited extent, and by his power, first of speech, then of reading and writing, he can record and so retain all these memories for his contemporaries and descendants.

There is no evidence that animals can foretell in any way what may or will happen in the future or make any attempt to do so. Man, on the other hand, in virtue of his logical powers—the arrangement of ideas—has the ability to foreshadow future events at least with a high degree of probability, and he can plan his conduct to fit what is likely to occur in the days to come. He can, moreover, compare his memories and plans with those of others and so modify, strengthen and correct the accumulated wisdom of his fellows.

His erect posture, with the consequent freeing of his upper limbs from the duties of locomotion, is of immense value to him, for this has enabled him to acquire manual dexterity. This has allowed him, not only to perform all sorts of tasks within his own strength, but also to make tools, which permit activities which he could not possibly do by himself. To take a simple example, the cave drawings of the late Pleistocene period show that the bow was a very early tool for the destruction of wild animals, which were the staple food, as well as the enemies of mankind. The bow is drawn by the muscular strength of the bowman, but this strength is applied relatively slowly, is capitalised and then released all at once to propel the arrow, which is thus provided with a *vis-a-tergo* much in excess of anything which the unaided arm could give. After all it is only the application of the same principle of tool making enlarged and extended by the transmission and comparison of memories and plans which has produced the modern internal combustion engine, the aeroplane and the wireless receiver.

Man's power of planning has also enabled him to adapt his body in such a way that he can live in the arctic circle or at the equator, in the desert or on the lonely island in the midst of the ocean. If he is cold he can cover himself with artificial clothes, he can build shelters both to keep him warm and to keep him cool and above all he can provide himself with fire, which gives him warmth and light. This harnessing of fire was a very early discovery dating back to the time when the ice ages, the first of which began half a million years ago, long before man had appeared on earth, were still affecting the temperature of our planet.

The Endocrine Glands

All these achievements depend on the growth of man's brain and this is of the highest importance in the study of his personality; but this is not the place to discuss in detail its structure and function. This brain, if it is to work properly, must be kept healthy and properly nourished. Therefore the other systems of his body, respiratory, circulatory and digestive, are all important for building and repairing his body as a whole and his brain in particular, and therefore have their significance in the composition of the corporeal state of man. Of all the systems which have this function of keeping the brain in full working order, perhaps the most important is the group of endocrine glands. These glands which pour their secretions directly into the blood stream have been likened to an orchestra with the pituitary gland as their leader. They must all work together in harmony under the general control of the pituitary or damaging discords will appear with the most far-reaching effects. If they work in harmony and supply their secretions in due proportion, then body and brain work smoothly and efficiently, but if there is too much of one secretion or too little of another, then imme-

diately this efficient working ceases and the whole personality may be changed.

If the body and brain, their nourishment and health determined by heredity and social heritage, are the basis of the individual, what is of more importance to us here is how these contribute to his mind, for by his mind he reacts to his environment, and it is this reaction to his environment which is our principal theme in the conception of his soul.

Body and Mind

The relationship of mind and body and mind and brain has been a matter of inquiry and dispute, ever since the earliest beginnings of philosophy. Theories have ranged from the Berkeleian contention that body is nothing but an experience of the mind and that there is no evidence for the existence of the material world outside the experience of the individual, to the Behaviouristic contention that mind is nothing more than a series of conditioned reflexes, the function of a more than usually complex nervous system.

Perhaps it is fairest to say that the final answer to this conundrum has not yet emerged, but the fact that mind is closely connected with brain is not a matter of dispute. Defect or injury of the brain is closely reflected in a defect or injury of the mind. Changes in the working of the brain, such as are produced by disturbances in the balance of the endocrine gland secretions, modify the mind and the behaviour of the individual. Most simple behaviour patterns are undoubtedly examples of function of parts of the nervous system, just as circulation of the blood is the function of the heart and blood vessels, and we can trace a gradation of more and more complex patterns of behaviour, related to the functions of the higher levels of the brain. By higher levels of the brain we mean those parts of the brain, which have appeared later in the evolutionary history of the race and the life history of the individual, some of which levels are only possessed by man, thereby differentiating him from the rest of the animal kingdom.

As we trace these patterns of behaviour, as they become more complex, we find that they show more and more relationship to past events, are more and more successfully adapted to present situations and more and more purposive towards the future. With this increased complexity we find it more and more difficult to correlate behaviour with the functions of different parts of the brain. There is no point at which we can say "Here mind begins" and thus work on the assumption that we are dealing with a separate entity, which can be clearly differentiated from mere bodily function.

The Higher Manifestations of Mind

There is no satisfactory evidence that disembodied mind exists. This evidence would be afforded if spiritualistic manifestations could be

scientifically proved, for then there would seem to be some "thing" of the nature of mind which could act independently of a body. So far, however, these manifestations have not stood the test of strict scientific investigation.

The evidence in favour of telepathy or thought transference would seem to be stronger, but even this is by no means firmly established as a proven fact. Even if it were it would not prove for certain the existence of disembodied mind, for although various forms of signalling, speech and writing are the only methods of communication of which we know for certain, whereby one person can communicate with another and so transmit his thoughts, yet we cannot be perfectly certain that some more subtle means may not be possible. This may only be dimly and uncertainly available to certain specially favoured individuals and it may work just as does wireless transmission, only being capable of transmitting messages between a specially tuned transmitter and an equally specially tuned receiver.

It would seem much more likely that the individual mind essentially depends on the working of the brain and can have no existence independently of that organ. Modern research on the function of the higher levels of the brain shows that the possession of these levels endows the individual with certain capacities, and the absence or destruction of these levels deprives him of these capacities. The chief of these are discrimination, integration and reference in time and space. These functions are very definitely mental and it is certainly not impossible to imagine that all mental functions, reflective, prospective, perceptual or conceptual, are functions of these higher cortical levels.

There would seem, therefore, to be no need to postulate a separate body and a separate mind, but rather to consider them as parts of a whole body-mind individual, in which mind is a function of brain and brain is conditioned by the rest of the body. Body-mind must be considered as a whole. This body-mind reacts with the environment in space—here and there—and in time—in the past, present and future. All these taken as a whole make up what we conceive to be the basis of the soul.

As brain becomes more complex in structure, so its function becomes more involved and intricate, so that it becomes more and more difficult to distinguish the independent functions of this or that part of the brain. Indeed we suspect that much of mental function depends on the working of the brain as a whole, but perhaps at different tempos and as it were in different keys. Be that as it may, mental function is too complicated to correlate with brain function in the present state of our knowledge, however much we may suspect that if only we did know more we might succeed in unravelling that correlation. So it is easier, at present, to study mind on its own and consider its scope irrespectively of the physiology of the brain. This study we call psychology, a science, which of recent years has done much to clarify and codify man's behaviour.

In this study then, which we must follow if we are to arrive at our conception of the soul, we leave anatomy and even physiology altogether for the time being, although even now these sciences, lumbering far behind though they may, are treading the same paths towards the understanding of mental function and cannot be left out if we are to have a complete conception of the soul.

The Study of Mind

Psychology, or the study of mind, presents for our observation and experimentation three fields; these are the processes of knowing (cognition), feeling (affect) and of willing (conation). By cognition we receive the message of events around us, gather together the knowledge of the past, co-ordinate them and make plans for the future. From these we ultimately build up a philosophy of life. By affection we feel the pleasure and the pain, the tension and the relaxation, which give colour and warmth to our experience and give us our emotional life. From this we build up the dominant sentiment under which we live our lives. By conation we will and carry into action the products of our impulses and so shape the behaviour by which the world knows us.

The driving force behind our actions which determines their strength or weakness, is doubtless derived from feeling and the emotional pattern of our lives, while the guiding lines and plan of our action is determined by the cognitive aspects of our mind, by our philosophy of life.

If our emotions are co-ordinated and harmoniously balanced, then our actions will be smooth and appropriate to the occasion, but if our affections are in conflict, then our behaviour will stammer and stutter, now too violent and now too feeble, so that it is ineffective, misdirected and often at variance with all our plans. Similarly, if our cognition is not efficient, these plans made up from perceptions, ideas and memories, may be incomplete, contradictory or futile, and we shall have no coherent and established philosophy of life to guide us on our journey from the cradle to the grave. Let us now consider this question of a philosophy of life.

CHAPTER II

MAN'S PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

Definition of a Philosophy of Life

By a philosophy of life is meant a concerted plan, whereby the individual may direct his sojourn through life. To be complete it should answer the questions, "Why was I born?" "Why am I alive on this earth?" "What should be the object of my life?" "What rules should I obey during my life?" "What will happen at the end of my life?" "What is the relation between me and things that have been, those that are here now, and those that shall be hereafter?" Most people want to know what is their relation to God, whatever that word may mean, but above all everyone wants a plan. As Rivarol said:—

"Il me faut, comme à l'universe, un dieu qui me sauve du chaos et de l'anarchie de mes idées. . . . Son idée délivre notre esprit de ses longs tourments, et notre cœur de sa vaste solitude."

After all, man's philosophy of life is, in the widest sense of the term, his religion.¹

As has already been said, man is distinctive in possessing an infinite capacity for asking why and the questions which the full philosophy of life ought to be prepared to answer have exercised the mind of man ever since he began to think. The wisest men of every age have sought to find the answers to the main questions, namely what is man's relation to the universe and his purpose as a part of it? No doubt to begin with, the search was chiefly for the purpose of satisfying his own inner urge for answers, but if he could find the perfect answer, it would, of course, be of benefit to all mankind. If his philosophy was to have been of benefit to everyone, then this very universal benefit would, of necessity, give the philosopher, as its author, power to guide and then to dominate his fellows, and too often the temptation to acquire power has clouded the search for truth.

¹ cf. Thomas Carlyle:

"The thing a man does practically lay to heart and know for certain, concerning his vital relations to this mysterious universe and his duty and destiny there, that is in all cases the primary thing for him and creatively determines all the rest; that is his religion."

Power too often the Predominant Motive of the Philosopher

If the first philosophy of life had been perfect, no doubt much trouble and strife would have been avoided, since the philosopher who found this perfect truth would have followed it himself, and thereby would have been prevented from abusing this power, which his discovery must give him. An immediate discovery of an all-satisfying philosophy of life could not, of course, be expected in the rapidly changing conditions of human society. Indeed, the perfect philosophy of life has not yet been found.

"But you, gods, will give us some faults to make us men."¹ This being so the philosopher has always tended to exhibit the chief of these faults, by seeking to impose his philosophy on his fellow men, no doubt from conscientious motives to begin with, fully convinced that he was conferring great benefits upon them. All too soon, however, the conscious or unconscious desire for power, which is inherent, almost inevitably, in the founder of a new religion, became the predominant motive. Then those, often of baser metal than himself, whom the Founder or the Führer persuades, see advantages for themselves in the imposition of these beliefs on others and too easily the statement of the supposed truth gives place to persuasion, persuasion to coercion, and coercion to persecution.

Philosophy or Religion

It is obvious that all religions must be in their nature a philosophy of life, but every philosophy of life is not necessarily a religion. It depends on its scope. The Platonic ideal of the city state was an incomplete philosophy of life, but not a religion. A religion involves a universality of appeal—a single person's philosophy can hardly be called a religion; a relation to some magical or supernatural force or being, which is held to influence the lives of men, has hitherto been a postulate of all religions. Such are no doubt grafted on a very fundamental impulse of mankind, for:

"The whole world is actuated by a passionate love of God."²

On this definition, Confucianism is much less of a religion than other creeds, for Confucius was never deified and his teaching was a practical guide to conduct, without the mystical overlarding which distinguished the other oriental doctrines such as those of Tse and Buddha.

Man has, however, almost always found it necessary to postulate something outside his direct experience, something with powers other than his own which, working by magic or supernatural agencies, have brought about results he could not otherwise explain. At the same time

¹ W. Shakespeare: *Antony and Cleopatra*, v. 1.

² Aristotle: *Metaphysics*.

he has been dimly aware that he has some claim to have some part himself in this supernatural being.¹

Temporal Power and Spiritual Power

This being so it became an added method of power politics for these, who adhered to the new religion, to claim for it Divine revelation, which only they could interpret, thus giving their teaching, and incidentally themselves, a cachet and authority based on the necessity felt by almost all men to postulate a supernatural God or gods.

Directly philosophers become entangled in the mesh of power politics, they are bound to become deteriorated and decadent, for power must influence their conclusions and so their philosophy soon leaves the rigid and disciplined path of truth. Few will deny that temporal power has decreased if not destroyed the spiritual power of all religions and the specious argument that it is necessary to attain temporal power to spread the true religion is all too clearly rationalization. That this has been realized by certain religious bodies at least, is seen by their spontaneous agitation for disenfranchisement and disestablishment.

It will scarcely be denied that no perfect philosophy has yet been reached, but many, notably Christianity, Mahomedanism and Buddhism have attracted very numerous adherents, because without doubt they contain in their teaching much that is universally true and of high value. Of these, at least the first two have striven, by force if necessary, to become world-wide and all-embracing and have conspicuously failed.

From this rivalry of creeds, it is obvious that man has found that his demands differ and that no creed, no philosophy so far promulgated, will satisfy the whole human race. Even the authority of divine revelation and political power have not sufficed to coerce him into one belief, and even within the folds of official religion it is painfully obvious that many individuals adhere to the creed by reason of expediency alone.

Quot homines tot sententiae

The fact that would seem to emerge is that, although in this respect the old adage, *Quot homines tot sententiae* is an overstatement, there can

¹ cf. W. Goethe: *Das Göttliche*.

"All hail the unknown ones,
All hail the divine,
Whom we darkly grope after . . .
And fain would resemble,
In their good we believe,
Because good is in man.

To the glory of man
To be helpful and good,
Unwearied procuring
The useful, the right,
A prototype so
Of the gods we grope after."

be no guarantee that the philosophy of life which seems sufficiently adequate to one man may not be quite inadequate for his neighbour.

The explanation of this may lie in the fact that the human intellect is not yet capable of apprehending truth as a whole and an absolute, but can only grasp certain indications and aspects of truth. There is reason to believe, however, that certain of the more successful religions, that is to say, those which have attracted the largest number of really genuine voluntary adherents, contain the closest approximation to real truth which can be apprehended by men of their age and race. But:

"I have still much to say to you, but you cannot bear it just now.

However, when the Spirit of Truth comes, he will lead you unto all Truth."¹

To certain very broad general principles, almost all mankind, at least in its more expansive moments, is willing to adhere and, as Yeardsley² has pointed out, the principle of Reciprocity—"do as you would be done by," is common to all ethical codes. This is expressed in the ideal epitaph from the Ancient Egyptian *Book of the Dead*, especially in the phrase, "I have made no man weep," for "Everything that lives—lives not alone, or for itself."³ Similarly an ambition to adhere to some general standard of behaviour, higher than that generally met with in the community, is fairly generally distributed, and these two principles are, of course, expressed in the "two great commandments," Love thy neighbour and Love thy God. This is expressed in modern terms by Lord Sankey and Robert Louis Stevenson:

"It is the duty of every man, not only to respect, but to uphold and to advance the rights of all other men throughout the world. Furthermore, it is his duty to contribute such service to the community as will ensure the performance of these necessary tasks, for which the incentives, which will operate in a free society, do not provide. It is only by doing his quota of service, that a man can justify his partnership in the community."⁴

and practically everyone is inspired by:

"The thought of duty, the thought of something owing to himself, to his neighbour, to his God: an ideal of decency to which he would rise if it were possible: a limit of shame, below which, if it be possible, he will not stoop. . . . It is not alone their privilege and glory, but their doom: they are condemned to some nobility. All their lives long the desire of good is at their heels, the implacable hunter."⁵

But in most communities other laws have been added to these, some directed to the cohesion of the group, some to the preservation of health and others, much more artificial, to comply with the traditional customs

¹ The Gospel of St. John xvi, 12, 13 (Moffatt translation).

² M. Yeardsley: *The Story of the Bible*, p. 118.

³ W. Blake: *Book of Thel*, ii.

⁴ Lord Sankey: *Declarations of the Rights of Man*.
iii. *Duty to the Community*.

⁵ R. L. Stevenson: *Pulvis et Umbra*.

of the community. These with ritual observation directed to the appeasement or glorification of the particular form of deity, deities or semi-deities worshipped by the tribe, go to make up the religious code, which the specially privileged priest class strive to impose on the communicants.

The Rivalry of Priests and Kings

If the priests were the first to perceive their advantages, others soon showed an anxiety to share these with them. The ruling classes, identifying themselves, so far as possible, with the magical attributes of their deity, often find it advantageous to ally themselves to, or even to assume the functions of the priesthood, or certain of the priests assumed kingship, although in some cases, of course, the rivalry of power politics drove these two classes into opposition.

In spite of the implied dominance of a limited section of the community, it would seem that there are some people, and even peoples, who are content to accept this imposed religion or philosophy of life and use it with more or less strict observance as their guide through life. There are others, the protestants, in the widest sense of the term, who are not content to live their lives in strict obedience to a doctrinal code, but claim the right to think out for themselves what they shall believe and largely how they shall behave.

As Blake says:—

“I must create a system or be enslaved by another man,
I will not reason and compare; my business is to create.”¹

In the history of these protestants, however, it has often happened that sects and groups have arisen, whose power-priests have imposed, and whose members have accepted, codes and doctrines quite as rigid as those of the orthodox churches from which they originally seceded. It does also happen that the genuine protestant works out for himself a philosophy or religion, differing but little from those imposed by the priests; nevertheless this does not alter the fact that he has demanded and exercised freedom in his choice. He has, so far as in him lies, determined for himself and by himself the plan whereby he shall guide his life.

Free Will and Free Thought

This question of freedom of thought is important, for it is undoubtedly a function of the higher and more complex development of brain and so of mind, which man and specially civilized man enjoys. This conception is not necessarily tantamount to freedom of will, the existence of which is a question hotly argued and not yet settled. Apparent freedom of thought may only be a variation of thought and the apparent power of directing thought at will may be nothing more than the resultant of the influences of inherent constitution and the more or less chance accidents

¹ W. Blake: *Jerusalem*, x, 20.

of the environment. The subject of the existence of free will and its relation to free thought is a bone of contention which will, no doubt, take long to settle. What is of more importance in the present argument is whether a man exercises a higher function in formulating his own philosophy of life, or whether he would have been better to submit to a philosophy formulated for him, by what his priests will tell him is Divine inspiration, or his legislators will affirm is founded on the accumulated wisdom of his forbears. The answer will of course depend on the value and pragmatic usefulness of the particular philosophies of life in question. As to this, it is probable that our critical capacities are not yet sufficiently developed to form a reliable judgment; in any case the perfect philosophy of life, whether formulated collectively or individually, has not yet emerged.

In the present state of our knowledge and mental development we must acknowledge that the picture drawn by Milton still pertains:

"Others apart sat on a hill retired
In thoughts more elevate and reasoned high
Of providence, foreknowledge, will and fate,
Fix'd fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute
And found no end, in wandering mazes lost."¹

That there is variety of thought is axiomatic, on the premise that there is variation in the structure and function of the brain, on which thought depends. It is apparent, moreover, when we consider that at the highest levels of brain development, the recall of past events is possible: that we can perceive and enumerate current events and determine which are of most importance; in these respects much power is given to us. Still more can we do, when, given these data, it is possible to co-ordinate and arrange them in time and space, so as to build them up into generalizations and thus to arrive at conceptions and abstractions. With all these powers, therefore, neither events nor ideas can appear identical to any two individuals and so, in that sense, each person must have his own separate and distinguishable philosophy of life, even though it is founded on an orthodox code. The only question remains, how far, and with what skill and satisfaction, each one builds his own.

Man's Need for a Philosophy of Life

It is possible that these philosophies of life, which do not closely conform to any standard pattern, only seem to be individually constructed and have this appearance only because, being so different, they appear as if they must have been the personal creation of the individual but may only represent his interpretation of a general conception. It is also possible that apparent blind adherence to an orthodox creed really represents an individual philosophy of life deliberately chosen by the individual. In fact, since each individual thinks and expresses himself in his own way and to a large extent uses simulacra as practical counters

¹ J. Milton: *Paradise Lost*.

in a pragmatic world, we cannot yet be dogmatic as to the true origins of philosophies of life any more than we can be as to their actual truth. At least we can strive,

"To discover, comprehend and actually to master that fragment of the Divine law, which is accessible to human faculties; to translate it in action (as far as human powers allow) here, where God has placed us, is our aim, our duty. We are each and all of us bound to strive to incarnate in humanity that portion of eternal truth which it is granted to us to perceive, to convert into an earthly reality so much of the kingdom of heaven—the Divine conception permeating life, as is given to us to comprehend. Thus we are slowly elaborating in man the angel; failing to do this we shall have to retrace our path.

"Each of you may do this (promote the Divine law) according to his sphere, if he look beyond the limited horizon of self. Look from the family to the commune, from the commune to the nation, from the nation to humanity, from humanity to the universe, from the universe to God. Let every act be such as, if accepted as the rule by the whole generation, would increase the actual sum of good or decrease the actual sum of evil."¹

Acceptance or Construction of a Philosophy

It would appear, therefore, that every man chooses either to accept a ready-made philosophy of life, as presented to him by one of the dogmatic religions, or to endeavour to build up one for himself. If he does not succeed in doing one or the other he is in a bad way, for he is like a rudderless ship sailing on an uncharted ocean. There are some people who think so little, that their sole philosophy is to do as their neighbours do and conform to the customs of the tribe, whether that tribe be a community of primitive savages or a social set in a provincial town. This may work well enough so long as things go on relatively smoothly and the tribe remains a coherent body, but if some upheaval occurs, whether in the personal life of the individual or in national politics, which flings them out of their envelope of protective custom, these people may become very lost and very distressed. They are apt to suffer from one variety of what is popularly called a nervous breakdown. This may cause them the more distress in as much as, previously, they have thoughtlessly adopted the attitude of insolent superiority, bred of ignorance and prejudice, with which their set have regarded those suffering from something which they do not understand. To find that they themselves are afflicted with such a complaint fills them with such shame that they insist that they must be suffering from some organic disease, which in their eyes is much more respectable and for which they would expect full sympathy, which they would never dream of extending to their miserable neurotic brethren. This merely illustrates the stupidity of these people, who are most difficult to deal with, for,

¹ J. Mazzini: *From the Council to God*.

never having learnt nor troubled to think, they are not easily persuaded to build up a philosophy of life for themselves or even to attempt to do so. Once having been let down by their ready-made philosophy they are afraid to try to build a new one or even to accept one ready-made and so wallow through life without anything on to which they can hold.

At the other end of the scale are those whose philosophy, generally of their own construction, is so contrary to that accepted by the majority that, though they hold to it firmly enough, they are so at variance with everyone else that there is no peace where they are. "Everyone is out of step except our Bill," which is not a comfortable state of affairs for Bill. When such a person is of very strong and pertinacious character, he may go a long way towards his somewhat selfish ends, but in the human community he is not likely to get any great distance, unless he attracts a certain number of adherents to his own way of thinking. This he will only do if the roots of his philosophy are founded on the soil of the general.

The pack, human or otherwise, will turn and rend the member who is quite different, but may accept as leader one who brings forward original ideas, but whose main tenets are in accordance with the rest. Whether such a leader will bring his flock forwards or backwards or sideways into the wilderness will depend on whether his new ideas are nearer to absolute truth or in opposition to it, or irrelevant to either the positive or negative poles.

The Qualities of Leadership

The trouble is that the mass of mankind, being almost unaware even of the nature of truth in the absolute, can seldom recognize in what direction their leader is taking them and it remains for history to determine whether his leadership was good, bad, or just indifferent. It has been said that the masses are almost unaware of the nature of truth or so it would sometimes seem, but it is probable from the evidence of history that they have at least some intuitive perception of truth. We can, in fact, be sure of the accuracy of Lincoln's dictum that "you can fool some of the people all the time, you can fool all the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time." It is to be hoped that this modicum of wisdom to be found in the masses will grow until it can leaven the whole lump and that in time the people will more quickly recognize the leader who will indeed lead them out of the wilderness. For this purpose the thoughtless are no good, the eccentrics are no good. The real leaders must be of the people and from the people. Their philosophy of life must be simple enough for the people to understand, but it must have just that difference that gives inspiration and, if the leadership is to be fruitful and directed towards the goal of happiness, it must, whether by intuition or by deliberate planning, be further along the road to truth than the base from which it sprang.

In the past the "Leader" has been a person, an individual who has

voiced and symbolized an idea, which has apparently needed him to act as a mouthpiece. The danger of the leader is that he will be tempted by power politics and fall into this temptation. Christ resisted it but his Church has not. There is no real necessity for this mouthpiece, however, and a lead could perfectly well be given by the idea permeating all mankind. This was the message of the Gospel of St. John, who envisaged such a universal idea in the mind of God.

"The Logos (Logos—Wisdom, but Bridges translates it Mind¹)
 existed in the very beginning,
 The Logos was with God,
 The Logos was Divine.
 He was with God in the very beginning,
 Through him all existence came into being,
 No existence came into being apart from him.
 In him life lay, and this life was the Light for men.
 Amid the darkness the light shone,
 But the darkness did not master it."²

The best Philosophy is simple and therefore adaptable

No personality, no soul can be significant without a philosophy of life and it may be of his own creation or borrowed from others, according to his temperament and what may appear to be his choice. But to be effective it must be simple. Broad general principles are best which can be adapted to meet changing circumstances, but which give a coherent whole to the pattern of life. Too great detail is restrictive and is sure to break down when the necessity comes to meet an unexpected event. So is too rigid a code of specified rules, for rules cannot be made to fit every circumstance and it must be remembered that human wisdom is too limited to predict and provide for every turn of fortune's wheel.

The most striking example of the drastic simplification of a complex ethic was in the teaching of Christ, when he reduced the enormously complicated skein of Jewish law to the simple two great commandments, "Love thy God," and "Love thy Neighbour." But if we can get a conception of God sufficiently wide and sufficiently all-embracing, then loving God will include the loving of our neighbours. And so the philosophy of life is reduced to a still simpler maxim.

"He who does not love, does not know God; for God is love."³
 and Tolstoi puts it even better, for he says:

"Love is God" and "Life is God."⁴

To advance along the path of moral progress, man must set a course.

"I believe that in the mysteries of life there is benignity. . . . There are new victories we shall win, new territories we shall explore.

¹ R. Bridges: *The Spirit of Life*.

² The Gospel of St. John 1, 1 (Moffatt's translation).

³ First Epistle of St. John iv, 8 (Moffatt's translation).

⁴ L. Tolstoi: *War and Peace*, XII, xvi and XIV, xv.

We shall march against the oldest enemies, against fear and cruelty, untruth and greed. We shall send our voyagers into the new lands of peace and justice, of understanding and high endeavour. . . . Set us a proper course and we shall not fail you. Set us a proper course."¹

The course which each man sets for himself or is set for him is his philosophy of life.

The Ideal Philosophy

It is suggested that the philosophy of life which will be the most helpful for the progress of mankind is that map which shows most clearly the way to the quality of Deity, by way of love and happiness, which is the aim, as we shall see, of Humanity.

This philosophy would answer the questions put at the beginning of the chapter as follows, and these answers will be dealt with in greater detail in the course of this book.

Why was I born?

Because I am part of the living manifestation of the Universe which exists and is, at least so far as life is concerned, in the process of progress from chaos to harmony.

Why am I alive on this earth?

To give me a chance to help in this progress.

What should be the object of my life?

To do all I can to bring happiness to the greatest number and so promote the progress of Humanity, of which I am a part, towards Deity.

What will happen at the end of my life?

My body will die, but my influence will continue, in accordance with the degree in which I have succeeded in loving God (Deity).

What are the relations between me and those that have been, those that are here and now and those that shall be hereafter?

I am part of the whole, past, present and future. I am influenced by the whole and in turn influence the whole.

¹ E. Linklater: *The Raft*.

THE SENTIMENT OF THE LOVE OF GOD

The Drive to Action

In the last chapter we have considered how the ideas and thoughts of individuals and groups of individuals may be arranged and co-ordinated into a pattern which will serve as a guide to the conduct of life, and how, without such a guide or pattern, progress through life is a chaotic and misguided affair. But ideas and thoughts, cognition, to use the technical term, are not the driving force of life, they are only the map by which this drive may be directed.

It used to be thought that ideas drove the individual into action, and the ideo-motor psychology held the field for some time; more recently, however, it has been recognized that the dynamic factor in behaviour is feeling-emotion, the affective aspect of life.

This is much more in accordance with physiological teaching, for we find that the centres associated with feeling and emotion are in that part of the brain known as the thalamus and the hypothalamus, with connections to areas of the cortex less well defined. These same thalamic and hypothalamic regions are closely related to that part of the nervous system, the autonomic system, which regulates the internal organs of the body.

This autonomic regulation is associated both anatomically and physiologically with the endocrine glands chiefly through the pituitary gland. These glands hold and prolong activities started by the autonomic nervous system. Affecting circulation, respiration and the rest of the functions of the body, this autonomic-endocrine apparatus prepares the body for activity or relaxation as the case may be.

The Evolution of Affect

Further it is a matter of common observation that the determinants of the body's activity and relaxation are feelings and emotions. The most primitive of these are the so-called tropisms. These are observable even in the most lowly organisms, which turn away from noxious objects and towards things, such as food, which are beneficial.

As we ascend the animal scale, these feelings and the reactions which they induce become more complex. Hunger and sex determine approach, and self-preservation, with its feeling of fear, determines withdrawal or flight from danger. Later still we find that anger may stimulate attack; curiosity, investigation; and other instinctive ex-

periences, always associated with feeling, determine their appropriate reactions.

In the higher animals we find that the various responses of different species to a situation, which normally calls out an instinctive reaction, may show considerable variation. Thus on the approach of danger the horse will run away, the hare will lie still and sham death and the chameleon will change its colour. Still the behaviour is, on the whole, constant for the species. Man, on the other hand, may do any of these things, even to changing colour, though perhaps not in a protective way. In other words his behaviour is less rigid and therefore may be more suited to the circumstances: even at the instinctive level. Man is not, however, bound by instinct alone, and in face of danger he may manifest behaviour more appropriate to another set of circumstances, so that instead of running away or hiding, he may advance to attack his enemy.

His behaviour then is more plastic than is that of the animals and therefore may be more successful. He can discriminate the degree of his feelings and be conscious of their nature, so can adapt his behaviour to fit these. Whether the resultant behaviour is "freely chosen" or merely the resultant of many impulses, acting at the same time and the same place, is still a matter of dispute. Actually the control and discrimination of instinctive behaviour is more important than so-called free choice for:

"A man's inability to moderate and control his passions, I call servitude. Most people seem to believe that they are free, just in so far as they may obey their lusts."¹

The action and interaction of instincts in any sort of behaviour is a complicated study, which has been undertaken by many psychologists and it is not proposed to recapitulate that work here. Shand² and McDougall³ pointed out that ultimately the emotional experience of the individual is co-ordinated and integrated into what they called sentiments.

Sentiments

The sentiment is a constellation of emotional reactions centred on an object or a situation. Thus love for a person or hate of a person are sentiments. The sentiment of love is centred on a certain person and the lover fears danger for the loved one, is angry with those who may threaten or ill-use her, is curious about her body and mind and is generally "taken up" with her whole personality. He is elated at having won her love, is abased at what he regards as her superiority to himself, is sexually attracted to her, feels tenderness towards her, so that he is continually concerned for her welfare and so on and so on. All these emotional feelings interact to make up a dynamic resultant, which is the drive behind

¹ Spinoza: *De Servitude Humana. Ethics, IV.*

² A. F. Shand: *The Foundations of Character.*

³ W. McDougall: *Social Psychology.*

his behaviour towards her, and indeed may be the drive behind all his behaviour, if his love is violent or intense, at least for that period of his life during which his mind is centred on this love.

But sentiments may wax and wane, may change their balance and significance in the individual's life as a whole. The object may change, love may increase or diminish, or disappear, or may be replaced by a different sentiment altogether, that of hate. Again, two sentiments may come into opposition with each other and cause conflict in a person's life. Thus love for a wife or sweetheart may come into direct opposition with ambition for a career and, until some solution of this conflict is found, the individual may be so disturbed that happiness and efficiency are impossible. He will neither love well, nor will he follow his career with any success. Here is a fruitful source of "nervous breakdown," which will persist until he abandons one to cleave to the other, or discovers some working compromise whereby they are no longer in serious opposition. Such a conflict must obviously use up energy, which might otherwise be used productively, hence the inefficiency. McDougall¹ has stated that the highest and best organization of the individual will be achieved when one sentiment definitely dominates the rest. For a time, the sentiment of love for a sweetheart or a wife may dominate the personality of the subject and colour his whole behaviour, but this does not always last. Such a sentiment may fade away and be replaced, or come into opposition to another, with resultant conflict, inefficiency, and unhappiness.

The Dominant Sentiment

McDougall suggests that the ideal sentiment which should dominate the rest is the sentiment of self-regard, in which the self with his own interests and happiness is the centre of the constellations of emotions. This may, of course, include love for the wife, ambition for the career, as well as other minor sentiments, as interest in philosophy and acquisitiveness in respect of old china or sporting prints or a host of others. But in so far as the self is the centre, these subsidiary sentiments will not come into conflict, but will fall into place in the general scheme, so as to colour and enrich his life without disturbing it.

It would appear that, as thus expressed, the advantage of the self was the chief aim in life, though admittedly this was not entirely what McDougall meant. But considering for the moment self-regard in its literal sense, this would mean that it would work within a very limited map or philosophy of life. It would mean the narrow philosophy of the self-seeking egotist, whose life plan involved only his own advantage, his own aggrandisement, his own pleasure and his own fame. Of such are the dictators and conquerors of the world, many of whom have achieved remarkable success within their narrow orbit. This success was perhaps all the greater because, since the orbit was narrow, the drive was not

¹ W. McDougall: *Social Psychology*.

dissipated on extraneous objects and so could be fully directed down the narrow road of their ambition. This is a simplification of philosophy and of sentiment, which is not desirable, and is certainly not the sort of simplification which was advocated in the last chapter. The simplification which is desirable is not one of binding within narrow limits, but of getting back to broad principles, untrammelled by rigid and petty rules. In fact:

"The only possible solution of the great human problems, the victory of social feeling over self love."¹

Too many people do not have a sentiment of self-regard or of anything else to bind their personalities together.² Some sort of dominant sentiment is absolutely essential, but a sentiment of self-regard, driving along within the restricted map of self-interest, at once comes up against the great principle of reciprocity—of "Do as you would be done by," which, as we have seen, was a universal tendency of human endeavour and a common factor in every ethical code. Nor could it possibly earn for the person who followed it the epitaph, "I made no man weep." We must therefore look for something broader, something more comprehensive, for the object of the dominant sentiment of our lives and, if we examine the lives of those men whom we regard as truly great we find that the self alone is not the centre of their emotional drives and that, indeed, self may be sacrificed in favour of something more, something beyond the individual. McDougall would certainly have agreed with this and the only quarrel we have with his teaching is the term "sentiment of self-regard," which does not seem happy. What is required is the sentiment of the self in relation to something above and beyond that self. We suggested that so far as the map, the philosophy of life, was concerned, the two great commandments comprised a useful generalization of a satisfactory philosophy. "Love thy neighbour" and "Love thy God" and that the last might well include the first if properly understood.

The Sentiment of the Love of God

It is suggested, therefore, that the dominant sentiment should be termed "The Sentiment of God-regard" or better "The Sentiment of the love of God." Here the term God is not used in the sense in which it would be used by many, but as the comprehensive term which covers all the conceptions of, and yearnings for, a higher and better state of existence. In much religious teaching we are told that the self is in

¹ A. Comte: *A General View of Positivism*, p. 413.

² "Within my earthly temple there's a crowd,
There's one of us that's humble, one that's proud,
There's one that's broken-hearted for his sins
And one, who unrepentant, sits and grins.
There's one who loves his neighbour as himself
And one who cares for naught but fame and pelf.
From much corroding care I should be free,
If once I could determine which is me."

Anon.

opposition to God, but here it is suggested that the self is part of the conception of God as it is worked out in this book.

"Civilization, indeed the whole duty of man, is the gradual self-adaptation of the human organism to its environment—an adaptation which must take place, and any attempts to hinder which are simply neither more nor less than disease. Progress, which it is our higher life to further, is a thing that will continue despite the opposition of individuals."¹

In this sense it is, therefore, legitimate that our emotional drives should be centred round ourselves, but only in so far as these selves of ours are related to something beyond ourselves and higher than ourselves and including the rest of humanity and perhaps the rest of the universe, in other words to God. In this conception then, we may have a sentiment of love for our sweethearts, but that love must not conflict with our wider duty to our neighbour and our God. Love must always make for good, or it is not love.² In other words in loving our sweetheart we must strive to make no other man weep. We must try to live up to that standard, which is higher than our natural selves. No doubt true love on the highest level will help and not hinder us in these purposes; but many forms of love do come into conflict with this highest plan, this more ideal philosophy.

Still more may our ambition for our career interfere with our higher development, at any rate as civilization is constituted at present. Such a sentiment may well tend to hinder the realization of the highest that is in us and that may well be the basis of much of the criticism of the capitalist system, though there does not seem to be any inherent reason why a capitalist system should necessarily prevent these higher ideals being reached. If we define God as an ideal of unselfishness and love, of Truth, Beauty and Goodness, how far the saying that it is harder for the rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle is universally true at this stage of human history, whatever it may have been 2,000 years ago, it is hard to say. Nowadays, there are many good rich men who do not make wealth and power their God or overriding sentiment. Nor, on looking round, do we always find that to be poor is to be virtuous. In theory, the communistic system would seem to favour the love of neighbour and even the love of God, but so far in practice, it does not seem to have worked out that way.

¹ W. H. Mallock: *The New Republic*, p. 111.

² cf. P. B. Shelley: *Prometheus* 111, iii.

"The low voice of love almost unheard
And dove-eyed pity; murmured pain and music
Itself the echo of the heart, and all
That tempers and improves man's life now free
. . . Love by him and us
Given and returned; swift shapes and sounds, which grow
More fair and soft as man grows wise and kind
And veil by veil evil and error fall."

It does not follow that some economic system cannot be discovered which will allow these ideals to be reached, whether it be on a benevolent capitalist model, or on that of state socialism or communism. The difficulty is that too many advocates of one or other "ism" lose sight of the ideals for which they profess to be working, in their anxiety to promote the particular philosophy to which they have adhered, either for their own material gain or the enhancement of their own self-esteem. It is not the political form that matters, but the degree to which the happiness of the greatest numbers can be achieved. It may be that:

"A man may engage freely in any lawful occupation, earning such pay as the contribution that his work makes to the welfare of the community may justify, or that the desire of any private individual or individuals for his products, his performances or the continuation of his activities may produce for him. He is entitled to paid employment by the community and to make suggestions as to the kind of employment which he considers himself able to perform. He is entitled to profit fully by the desirableness of his products and activities. And he is entitled to payment for calling attention to a product or conveying it to the consumers, by whom it would be otherwise unobtainable."¹

But it must never be forgotten that:

"Everyone has duties, duties towards all, but rights in the ordinary sense can be claimed by none. Whatever security the individual may require is found in the general acknowledgment of reciprocal obligations, and this gives a moral equivalent for rights as hitherto claimed."²

Similarly, to take another example, our interest in philosophy may or may not promote love of our neighbour or of our God, for it may mean a withdrawal from life's activities, so that all effort to do anything for the benefit of mankind is abandoned. It is an interesting point that a large proportion of the population of this earth, the great Buddhist community and other oriental cults, regard this withdrawal as the highest virtue and the best, indeed, the only way of expressing the love of God. To most Western minds such an attitude seems quite inexplicable, and merely a cowardly avoidance of responsibility.

"I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat."³

Positive Endeavour

To us the avoidance of evil cannot be so meritorious as the positive endeavour to do good. We may have to admit, however, that our endeavours to do good all too easily result in a greater evil than if we

¹ Lord Sankey: *Declaration of the Rights of man*. 6. *The Right to Work*.

² A. Comte: *A General View of Positivism*, p. 400.

³ cf. J. Milton: *Areopagitica*.

left well alone. To us, this does not alter the principle that, however mistaken, however unfortunate, our efforts may be, it is better to try to do something than to accept defeat and remain inactive. Besides, we may learn from the past, from the mistakes as well as from the successes of ourselves and others.

“What then is the use of History? . . . it is a voice for ever sounding across the centuries, the laws of right and wrong. Opinions alter, manners change, creeds rise and fall, but the moral law is written on the tablets of eternity. For every false word or unrighteous deed, for cruelty and oppression, for lust or vanity, the price has to be paid at last, not always by the chief offenders, but paid by someone. Justice and Truth alone endure and live.”¹

While the belief of such a large proportion of the human race in the virtue of abnegation must be treated with respect, such a belief does really deny two fundamental principles on which the present argument will be based, because there is evidence of their truth; namely that there is a definite progress discernible in the universe from chaos to harmony, and that the human being has a hand in, and is a part of, that progress.

We shall take leave therefore to assume that our lives are intended to be active and positive and not a mere negation of any purpose there may have been in our birth. We must therefore insist that our devotion to philosophy, and that philosophy itself, shall not hinder us in our proper practical work in the world.

Sometimes even our last example, a sentiment of the love of old china, may get so out of proportion that it deflects us from what we ought to regard as more useful occupations. The beauty by which we set so much store must be used to good account, so as to serve as a joy and inspiration to others as well as to ourselves. As William James has said, if we enjoy the beauty of a great musical performance, we should ensure that this enjoyment of beauty is at least sufficiently productive to urge us to speak kindly on our return from the concert to our maiden aunt who stayed at home.

The Use of a Dominant Sentiment

Our feelings and emotions then, should be so set, that, being properly proportioned, they drive us along the path set out by our philosophy of life. In other words our dominant sentiment should bear a definite relationship to our philosophy of life. If they are disproportionate, they will come into conflict with one another, and the force of the drive, and consequently the steadfastness of our behaviour, will be dispersed. If the drive behind our efforts is not in accordance with our philosophy of life then our conation or will, the third subject of psychological study, will be weak, we shall lose our way, and never arrive at the goal at which we aimed.

¹J. Froude: *The Science of History*.

If our philosophy of life is the map showing us the road to the quality of Deity, then let our dominant sentiment be the sentiment of the love of God, the God presently to be defined, which will impel us along this path until we have achieved Deity itself.

“Emerging in the Heaven that is pure light;
Light of the understanding, full of love,
Love of the true good, full of joy within,
Joy that transcends all the heart conceiveth of.”¹

¹ Dante: *Paradiso*, XXX (Laurence Binyon translation).

CHAPTER IV

THE IMPULSE TO PERFORM THE WILL OF GOD

The Function of Will

It is necessary next to consider the third function of the human mind, that of conation or will. This is so bound up with the affective or feeling function that it is difficult to keep them apart. Let us again refer to the mechanism of self-preservation to illustrate the point. A situation arises in which there is a threat to the person; he perceives danger, that is the cognitive manifestation; he feels fear, that is the affective manifestation; he experiences the impulse or will to run away, that is the conative manifestation. The resultant of all these is his behaviour. The strength of the impulse to flight is in direct proportion to the degree of fear he feels, but the process must be regarded as a whole.

The old controversy over the James-Lange theory as to whether he felt fear because he ran away, or whether he ran away because he felt fear, is unreal, for the whole process, the whole situation, is one and is really indivisible, although it can be looked at from various aspects. It is the situation comprising the interaction between the environment and the individual, therefore, that determines both that he shall feel fear and that he shall run away. These manifestations are both children of the same father and each one is complementary to the other.

The Brain Works as an Integrated Whole

Given the situation which is perceived by the sense organs, whether by vision, hearing or even smell or touch, with impulses passing all over the brain which now works in unison and as a whole, this produces mental as well as physical responses and, at this level, the mental results are more obvious than the physical.

“For when the waves hav pass’d the gates of ear and eye
all scent is lost: suddenly escaped the visibles
are changed to invisible; the fine-measured motions
to immeasurable emotion; the cypher’d fractions
to a living joy that man feeleth to shrive his soul.
How should science find beauty?”¹

Up to a point Bridges’s repudiation of science is justified, yet we are beginning to know more of the higher functions of brain and their

¹ R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, III, 769-774.

connection with mind, and what brain activity is correlated with cognition, affection and conation, and therefore with the perception of beauty or anything else.

Affection and conation, then, are dynamic and in normal circumstances are strictly proportionate to each other, so that the degree of the fear corresponds to the strength of the impulse to fly and consequently to the violence of the flight. One does not cause the other, they are derived from a common situation.

So in all behaviour, the feeling is accompanied by an impulse to action which is translated into actual activity. To the observer, the interesting point is the activity which results from this process, whether simple at the instinctive level, or complex at the level of full human brain development, a stereotyped response appropriate to the moment on the one hand, or a much more complicated and less predictable activity on the other.

Instinctive Reactions

At simple instinctive levels, there can be little doubt that the response is individual and appropriate to the moment. Danger threatens: the individual must be saved, and immediate flight takes place. Even at animal level, however, directly two or more instincts are aroused at the same time, by the same situation, the behaviour becomes more complicated and less predictable. When danger threatens both mother and young, the normal flight reaction of the mother is overcome and she will attack an enemy which she would never face if she were alone; or like the partridge drooping her wing, endeavour to lead the enemy away from her brood, before she takes to flight herself. This is the most primitive example of altruistic behaviour, for true altruism is not found even in the pack. Gregarious animals are by no means necessarily unselfish animals, just because they are gregarious; no doubt the individual obtains benefit from the united strength of the community, but he has to be sacrificed to the welfare of the many and the pack does not stay behind to succour the one wounded member.

Progress of Human Behaviour

In human society, however, with the establishment of the laws of reciprocity, behaviour is no longer individualistic, for not only is each for all as in the wolf pack, but we may begin to find that all may be for each. How far this all for each standard of behaviour has progressed and developed we shall have to discuss later on, but it is an important development in the evolution of society and depends on individual action being conducted within the plan of a reasonably developed philosophy of life approaching the quality of Deity. This behaviour takes place, moreover, under the impetus of a sentiment directed to man in relation to something higher than himself, which we propose to call the sentiment of the love of God.

"Man depends on co-operation and has been provided by nature, somewhat inadequately it is true, with the instinctive apparatus, out of which the friendliness required for co-operation arises, and those who have experienced love with any intensity will not be content with a philosophy that supposes their highest good to be independent of that of the person loved."¹

Development of Foresight and Judgment from Experience

But not only is behaviour seen to be less individualistic it is also less immediate. What is important in the instinctive flight reaction, is to get away from danger just as quickly as ever possible, but with human behaviour we find that at least as much of man's action is not a direct and immediate response to the present situation, but is guided by a consideration of the past and a prospective view of the future. In other words he uses his experience and power of foresight. It is important to note that such powers only belong to a fully developed man and that children and mental defectives who never develop beyond the mental levels of childhood do not use their experiences—children because they do not possess them, and backward people because they are incapable of bringing them to bear on the present situation, nor are they able to foresee, with any clarity, what may be the significance of the things which may happen in the future.

Fully developed man can, however, compare the present situation with similar or analogous events which have happened in the past and exercise a judgment as to whether the behaviour on that occasion was wise, productive or successful, and whether similar behaviour is applicable to the present situation. Having arrived at that judgment he has the power to modify his behaviour in the present, in the light of past experience. Further, using not only the memories of his own experience and actions, but also the history and tradition of the experiences of others, he is able to co-ordinate them, so as to foresee a picture of what is likely to happen in the future. He can, if he will, judge from this what the effect of his behaviour may be, and so mould his behaviour in the present that he will act in a way which will be to his highest advantage in the future.²

Faulty Judgment the Result of Inaccurate Memory

It must be remembered that the memories of man are not always accurate and his reading of history or acceptance of tradition is not

¹ B. Russell: *The Conquest of Happiness*, p. 41.

² cf. W. Shakespeare: *Hamlet*, IV, iv.

"What is man,
If his chief good, and market of his time,
Be but to sleep and feed? a beast, no more.
Sure, He that made us with such large discourse,
Looking before, and after, gave us not
That capability and godlike reason
To fust in us unus'd."

always in accordance with their real implication or truth. His judgment as to their similarity or analogy with the present situation is by no means always sound. Hence his behaviour based on these considerations is not always beneficial or advantageous. Furthermore his prophecies as to the future may be even more open to error and so his foresight may be gravely mistaken. However, the higher his intelligence and the better the ethical level of his philosophy of life and the more closely organized his sentiment of the love of God, the greater value is his behaviour likely to have.

“And surely it is not a vain dream that man shall come to find his joys only in acts of enlightenment and mercy, and not in cruel pleasures, as he doth now, in gluttony, lust, pride, boasting and envious self-exultation.”¹

Behaviour Controlled by Will

This brings us to a very interesting and important matter in the study of behaviour, namely how far is a man's behaviour within the control of what we call the individual will. We talk about making judgments and then willing our behaviour in accordance with them, but quite often circumstances intervene and we find ourselves unable to carry out what we had planned. Our will is then definitely limited by the environment, but we can overcome this by our power of sidestepping the situation, so that we can avoid the resistance of the environment. This is a development of the plasticity of our instinctive reaction, which allows us in face of danger to run away, be still, or attack the enemy. Whether we are directed to one or other of these actions by deliberate choice, or by the resultant effect of all sorts of other stimuli impinging on us at the same time as the dangerous situation, is a question which, as has already been said, is not yet decided and probably cannot be decided in our present state of knowledge.

At the highest levels, with the greater complexity of the situations which we meet, there is a tremendous increase in the potential “choice” of action, whether this be direct or short term, or indirect or long term in its object. With the increased complexity of the situation, there is a great increase in the actual and potential stimuli, which can impinge on us at any given moment and in any particular situation. Therefore it is much more difficult for the observer to decide or predict what the resultant will be. In so far as we have the power of seeing ourselves, which we certainly do enjoy at our higher levels, we are ourselves observers of our own behaviour and of the situations which give rise to it, and yet cannot always be certain of what we shall do.

The Conflict of Choice

In the simple danger situation the onlooker can observe the lion in the path and will predict with some certainty that the individual will run

¹ A. Dostoevski: *The Brothers Karamazov*.

away, though he must admit that he might try to hide or even, especially if he has a weapon in his hand, he might attack the lion. But if we observe the civilized and educated individual trying to decide on what should be the nature of his life work, at the outset of his independent career, the situation is very much more complex. In this case the stranger will be very incompletely informed about the influences and stimuli operating upon the subject engaged in making this "choice," and will therefore have great difficulty in predicting his behaviour.

Even the close friend or the relative, who is much more cognisant of the subject's past life and present circumstances, finds it very difficult to assess all the impinging forces and therefore, although his predictions as to the outcome of the situation will be more certain and more often right than those of the stranger, for all he knows the "chooser" may be driven by an impulse of which he knows nothing at all. He will therefore often find himself wrong and will say that the youth has made a choice which was not dictated by reason, or by the advice of his elders which must obviously have been right. The fallacious assumption here is that the wisdom and the advice given by his elders is necessarily a stronger stimulus to the young man than his own inner tendencies.

By far the most intimate observer is, of course, the subject himself. If anyone can, surely he ought to be able to foresee his behaviour and be quite certain what he is going to do. This, however, by no means follows, and the reason is that he may be driven by an impulse as to whose existence even he is blind or ignorant. It is a certain fact that behaviour, whether it is the result of so-called deliberate conscious choice or whether the subject is apparently driven to it against his will, will often turn out quite differently from what the observer or even the subject himself ever expected. For example, let us consider further the choosing of a career. The young man decides that he wants to follow a certain profession. He fails in the necessary entrance examination, but later succeeds in passing a much stiffer examination in another subject leading to another calling.

It all seems rather inexplicable; his friends may say he didn't work hard enough, or he was unlucky in the questions he got in that particular examination, or that the examiners were unfair to him. The student may accept one or all of these explanations, because it is better that he should have some explanation than none. Anyway, he wants to excuse his failure both to his friends and to himself. If he is really critical, however, he may feel that these reasons are not really satisfactory and that he cannot in truth explain why he did not pass the examination.

The real explanation probably is that in the first attempt he was hindered by the operation of contrary forces and impulses which effectively neutralised his efforts, but on the second occasion, although the examination was harder, these forces were not operating, so that the whole strength of his natural ability could be brought to bear on the

problem. In neither case was the subject aware of either the nature or even the existence of these forces.

Again, quite unforeseen circumstances may intervene from the outside. For example, his parents, who were prepared to finance his preparation for his chosen career, unexpectedly lose their money, or he himself has an accident or illness, which prevents him from doing the necessary work at the necessary time. The student then blames the environment, regards himself as the victim of malignant circumstances, curses his luck and, for the time being, may be so discouraged, that he ceases to exert any forward-looking effort at all. But:

“Our remedies in ourselves do lie
Which we ascribe to heaven; the fated sky
Gives us free scope; only doth backward pull
Our slow designs, when we ourselves are dull.”¹

“*We find Profit by Losing of our Prayers*”

What is interesting, however, is, how often these seeming disasters and setbacks all turn out for the best, and in spite of them, or even because of them, the student's career is more successful or he is happier than he would otherwise have been.

“We, ignorant of ourselves
Beg often our own harms, which the wise powers
Deny us for our good, so we find profit
By losing of our prayers.”²

On looking back on our own lives each of us must be able to recognize occasions, when our wishes seem to have been hopelessly frustrated, either by our own failures or by events which we attribute to fate outside of our control and yet, in the end, such frustrations seem to have turned out for the best.

The disappointment of an early love affair, which seemed to break one's heart at the time, has been followed by a happy marriage, which could never have been enjoyed had the first object of one's choice proved to be one's ultimate mate.

A frustration of effort in the choice of a profession, or branch of a profession, has been followed by devotion to another line, which has brought success and satisfactory adaptation, which could never have been achieved if the original plan had been followed.

A Special Personal Providence

Small wonder that many people think that some wise powers have a special consideration for us and guide us for our good. It does not, however, always work out like this, and sometimes the frustrations are only followed by failure and still worse frustrations, so that we are apt to think that some malicious demon dogs our steps and prevents us from

¹ W. Shakespeare: *All's Well that Ends Well*, I, i.

² W. Shakespeare: *Antony and Cleopatra*, II, i.

rising to the heights which we think we deserve. Mr. Martin Tupper would, no doubt, say, give Providence a chance and it will bring us through either to good or ill. But have we any right to postulate this special personal providence? If this mysterious special providence is no more than a bundle of independent individual providences, why are some people blessed with a good providence and other people with a bad providence? Or, if it is all one providence, why should it favour one and damn his neighbour without any very obvious reason for this discrepancy? Nettleship expresses the opinion of many people when he says:

"The only strength for me is to be found in the sense of a personal presence everywhere. . . . Into this presence we come, not by leaving behind what are usually called earthly things or by loving them less, but by living more intensely in them and loving more what is really lovable in them; for it is literally true, that this world is everything to us, if only we choose to make it so, if only we live in the present because it is eternity."¹

It is not always easy to believe in a presence external to ourselves which influences our behaviour and our fate. May it not be that the presence is in ourselves and that we ourselves really determine what is going to happen to us either in virtue of our constitution or perhaps by the exercise of our will? May it not be that it is we who mould providence and not providence which moulds us?

Firstly we shall have good fortune or bad in accordance with the harmonious integration of our impulses both towards each other and also towards the environment. This harmony will certainly depend on our philosophy of life, on the map by which we steer. It will also depend on the integration of our drives towards a worthy end, towards, as has been suggested, the self in relation to the highest—to God, the sentiment of the love of God.

Spiritual Success and Material Success

If we are not so organized, then none of our reactions is likely to make for harmony and happiness, and so frustrations will follow frustrations and failures will go on to worse failures. On the other hand, if we are organized on these lines, then success, not necessarily material success, but rather spiritual success, will be our fortune; and it not infrequently happens that spiritual success, since it implies smooth working at our particular job, brings at any rate some material success in its train.

"Man, son of earth and heaven, lies there not in the innermost heart of thee, a spirit of active Method, a force of Work? And burns like a painfully smouldering fire, giving thee no rest until thou unfold it, till thou write it down in beneficent facts around thee."²

¹ R. L. Nettleship: *Lectures and Memories*, I, 72.

² T. Carlyle: *Past and Present*, p. 223.

Secondly, this spiritual success seems to come to us as a harmony within ourselves, often in spite of ourselves and of our conscious wishes. This inner providence is not only determined by impulses of which we are aware, but also by others which are hidden from us in ordinary circumstances. It has been said that the observer, even if he be ourself, is often unaware of the whole situation and is often unable to understand the whys and wherefores of his own wishes. May it not be that, when providence seems to take a special hand in our affairs, we are really experiencing the fact that our personalities may be built better than we know and that among the host of impulses acting at the moment of our decisions are some of which we are not aware? Moreover these hidden impulses may run contrary to the conscious impulses of which we are aware and the resultant behaviour, though it may be less desirable than we had wished may, on the other hand, turn out to be much better than we had hoped. Our conscious will, therefore, should not always be our sole guide as to the outcome of our lives; often we may leave it to "providence" or, as we should prefer to call it, to our unconscious impulses, which so often turn out to be wiser than our conscious ones. The composite impulse, if it is to be beneficial, should be the impulse to conform to the ideals of Deity, the impulse to do the will of God.

Organization of the Conscious and Subconscious

To return to our example, it is not difficult to see how these impulses which were hidden from us, may well prevent us from passing an examination which is well within the compass of our intelligence, but if they were working favourably instead of unfavourably would allow us to pass one very much harder. As a matter of fact conflicting hidden impulses may seriously interfere with intellectual achievement, as is well known to all educationists. It is not every child who is falling behind his fellows in his school work who is deficient in primary capacity. Modern psychologists have shown that highly intelligent schoolchildren may neither advance in learning nor retain what they have learnt, as a result of unfavourable emotional situations, of which the child is unaware or at least as to the nature of which he is quite unable to give any coherent account.

It may be more difficult to realize that such hidden impulses might even determine the intervention of illness or the loss of the parents' money. In the majority of cases, no doubt, there is no connection at all. Still, as to the illness, the direct influence of such hidden impulses may be more important than would at first seem likely. If these impulses cause conflict, then this may be responsible for illnesses which are usually supposed to be induced entirely by physical causes. We are gradually coming to realize what a profound effect disturbances of mind can have on the normal health of the body. Even in the case of microbic infection such emotional disturbances may make the patient less able to resist the

invasion of the hostile germs and so he may succumb to an illness which he would otherwise have resisted.

Apart from this, in our example, the point is that he has allowed the illness or the loss of money to deter him from his goal, although he has won through to his second objective in face of difficulties which were really just as great and perhaps even greater. To reach the second goal he has worked sufficiently hard to have carried him over the obstacles in the path of his first goal, but whereas in the first case his work was obstructed by the internal friction, from which he was quite unconsciously suffering, in the second case the whole of his will, i.e. the whole weight of his personality was organized towards the goal. Thus, in spite of the hard work involved, he achieved his object, without the expenditure of undue effort.

Success will depend, then, on the organization of all impulses conscious as well as unconscious, towards a certain goal, and although much may be unconscious, such organization is not entirely outside a person's control. If the person's behaviour as a whole is to be of a high level and significant for good, the goal of his effort will be within the map of a worthy philosophy of life and his drives will be organized in a general sentiment of the love of God, and the organization of the impulses will be in the same direction, i.e. toward the will of God. Then his behaviour will lead him perhaps to individual success, but what is much more important, to the happiness of himself and others. His life will be in accordance with the quality of Deity, or if we like to put it in another way, he will perform the will of God.

"Will, then, as the agent in truly moral action is the whole organized nature of the person concerned. It is his personality as a whole, and so far is it from being an initial endowment of our nature, that the main function of education is to fashion it—a process which is only complete when the entire personality is fully integrated in a harmony of all its constituent elements."¹

¹ W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 234.

TRUTH, BEAUTY AND GOODNESS

The Quality of Deity

We have spoken in the previous chapters of the Quality of Deity. We must now discuss more exactly what we mean by this term. It is suggested that the factors which go to make up this quality are Truth, Beauty and Goodness, which have always been regarded as the attributes of God.

Our argument has been that man is going to get on best if his philosophy of life is adequate as a plan or map for the guidance of his conduct, and that it is likely that the best philosophy is the one that approximates most closely to Truth. He must also organize his feelings in a sentiment, which has as its object or centre, man's relationship to something beyond and higher than himself, which we have provisionally called the Love of God; and this organization, it is submitted, is in accordance with the true conception of Beauty. Finally, man's behaviour will be organized for the best, both consciously and unconsciously, if it results in his achieving a high standard of unselfish conduct, provisionally described as the Will of God. It is submitted that this organization of behaviour is in accordance with Goodness.

One of the earliest of all philosophers, Democritus, declared that, "The chief end is a contented mind." If it has any meaning at all, the contented mind is synonymous with Happiness and Happiness to be complete must be founded on Truth, Beauty and Goodness. It does not follow that these are the whole requisite, something greater may have to emerge from them. In fact, Temple says:—

"But none of these (Truth, Beauty and Goodness) cover the whole of life. Always there remains a self-centred area of life. . . . But there is another environment besides that of nature and human beings. It is that mind in which the cosmic process is grounded, that Spirit of the Whole which is most adequately conceived on the analogy of Personality such as our own, but freed from our limitations and fulfilling all that in us is a potential only."¹

Greek philosophy and most philosophers since that time, have held that the fundamental attributes of Deity are Truth, Beauty and Goodness and it is maintained that happiness will ultimately emerge from these and will only be attained when humanity acquires the quality of Deity. *It is desirable, therefore, to consider these three abstractions.*

¹ W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 243.

Truth

It is not easy to define any of them, because they are absolutes and abstractions. It is difficult for the human mind to grasp abstractions and still more difficult to grasp an absolute. Indeed, without complete knowledge, it is impossible to arrive at Truth, and man is still a very long way from possessing complete knowledge. Yet:

"After all, nothing but what is utterly true matters and we must believe in a progressive revelation and apprehension of truth, religious or otherwise. It will certainly mean that some things, perhaps some cherished things will have to go, but it will also mean that other and more central things will find convincing confirmation. They will be seen from a more soundly based standpoint, and gain an enhanced and enduring value."¹

No doubt in our present state of imperfection, all our Truth must be relative, but we must continually seek after it, for:

"Truth abideth and is strong for ever; she liveth and conquereth for evermore. With her there is no accepting of persons or rewards; but she doeth the things that are just, and refraineth from all unrighteousness and wicked things; and all men do like of her works."²

Speaking generally, a statement is more likely to be true the fewer exceptions there are found to exist to whatever it may lay down. All we can do at our present stage is to work with relative truths and these may be of use so long as they fit the facts as we know them. Thus the statement that the earth is flat may be sufficiently true for all practical purposes in a community living in a small area. But when someone observes that objects may rise over the horizon and realizes that this means that they are travelling on a curved course, then the "truth" that the world is flat becomes manifest as a falsehood and a better truth emerges, namely that the world is round, which is found to work better, because it is of wider application. This relative truth, that the earth is spherical, was held for a time, but further observation proved that this is not quite true either, for it is flattened at both poles, and so gradually we come nearer and nearer to absolute truth. What is truth for one generation is replaced by what appears to be a greater approximation to truth in the next, but it is quite clear that we are still a long way from absolute truth, which will "work" perfectly in all situations. Newton's physics was "true" for a long period until Einstein, whose theories were confirmed by those working with more delicate instruments showed that there were certain phenomena which could not be explained by Newton's laws and he had to work out new laws which would fit all the facts which Newton had observed and the new ones as well. The new laws we now accept as a closer approximation to truth, but in all probability they do not yet represent absolute truth. Absolute Truth

¹ D. Yellowless: *Psychology's Defence of Faith*, pp. 125-6.

² Esdras I, iv, 38-39.

will no doubt bring us nearer to happiness, but knowledge by itself is not enough.

"We know more than those who lived before us and if we are no happier, are on the way to be so. Wisdom is happiness, but, 'he that increaseth knowledge, increaseth sorrow.' Knowledge is not wisdom, it is only the rough material of wisdom. It must be shaped by reflection and judgment, before it can be constructed into an edifice fitting for the mind to dwell in, and take up its rest."¹

Still these relative truths are of great service and we cannot expect to arrive at absolute Truth all at once. At present:

"Qui veut voir parfaitment clair avant de se déterminer determine jamais."²

The Search for Truth

To arrive at Truth or the nearest approximation to Truth two things would seem to be necessary. The first is the power of clear thinking and secondly, for scientific investigation, the elaboration of precise instruments to help our observations. The second is, however, only a derivative of the first, for without clear thinking we cannot evolve precise instruments, which are properly adapted to the task for which they were devised. Further, if we think clearly, it must be obvious that we require these instruments, if we are to advance towards Truth. However, it must be remembered that these precise instruments can only be used to explore and extend that province of knowledge which is made up of these things which can be measured, in other words, in the province of science. By the methods of science we can measure more or less accurately the distance of the earth from the stars, or the size of the smallest particles of matter, and the relationship of one to the other, and so we learn more and more about the material aspects of the universe in which we live. This is an important primary task in the approach to ultimate Truth.

"Wisdom wil repudiate thee, if thou think to enquire WHY things are as they are or whence they came: thy task is first to learn WHAT IS, and in pursuant knowledge pure intellect wil find pure pleasur and the only ground for a philosophy conformable to truth."³

But no instruments so far devised, or ever likely to be devised, can measure absolute Truth, Beauty and Goodness and as we have seen in our search for Truth, Truth largely evades us. It is not only by devising means which include, but are not necessarily confined to, instruments to discover Truth, that we shall eventually achieve a complete realization of Truth. Indeed, by purely instrumental methods, we may even in some respects get further away from Truth. It must be with our own minds that we shall seek for her and mayhap find her, for Truth is an

¹ W. Hone: *Everyday Book*, II, 310.

² Amiel i, 108.

³ R. Bridges: *Testament of Beauty*, I, 129-133.

abstraction, and we cannot measure abstractions, though we may deduce them from measurable things. Moreover, it is one of the attributes of man in his full development to seek Truth.

"The enquiry of Truth, which is the love making or wooing of it, the knowledge of Truth, which is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign good of human nature."¹

Clear Thinking

But if we are to find Truth and if we are to convey any of this discovery to others, then we must be able to think clearly, logically, rationally and with full consciousness. This ability to some extent depends on our constitution and may also be acquired by study and application. It is our task to discover Truth which is itself inherent in the Universe.² Our maxim should therefore be:

"Soyons vrais, là est le secret de l'éloquence et de la vertu, là est l'autorité morale, c'est la plus haute maxime de l'art et de la vie."³

The mystics, however, would have it that we cannot think out Truth. For example, Powis⁴ would have us stop fussing and worrying about Truth and achieve a "loneliness" in which Truth will come to us, holding that:

"The noblest creation of the spirit is loneliness."

The Buddhists carry this further still, and would have us abandon all human endeavour and sink back into nothingness. But surely that is a negative individualistic happiness, which cannot be a plan for the good, which we have set before ourselves as our goal. This "good" involves man in relation to something outside himself, something towards which he must strive with all the power that is in him and for which he requires a plan, based not only on individual meditation, but on free interchange of ideas with others, so that all may benefit. Although we may be sceptical as to man's complete freedom of will, his power of reflection, of seeing himself, gives him some power over his environment and over himself and he must use all knowledge and wisdom to formulate his plan for reaching happiness. We cannot agree with the Preacher:—

"And I give my heart to know wisdom and to know madness and folly. I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit, for in much wisdom is much grief, and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow."⁵

¹ Francis Bacon: *On Truth*.

² cf. W. Pater: *The Renaissance*.

"Pico della Mirandola believed there was a spirit of order and beauty in knowledge, which would come down and unite what men's ignorance divided, and renew what time has made dim."

³ H. F. Amiel: *Fragments d'un Journal Intime*.

⁴ J. C. Powis: *In Defence of Sensuality*.

⁵ Ecclesiastes.

But:

"We must behold things as they are, and then belike we shall attain the wisdom that we desire, and of which we say we are lovers . . . and shall in ourselves have complete knowledge of the Incorruptible, which is, I take it, no other than the very Truth."¹

The tragedy is that so few human beings have the power to think really clearly, to use their powers of reason and logic and to bring everything up to the level of full consciousness. Unfortunately we must still say with Bacon:

"Doth any man doubt, that if there were taken out of men's minds, vain opinions, flattering hopes, false hopes, false valuations, imaginations as one would, and the like, but it would leave the minds of a number of men poor shrunken things, full of melancholy and indisposition, and unpleasing to themselves."²

Is Intelligence Improving?

The cynic has said that eighty per cent of highly civilized people are little better than mental defectives and that the general intelligence of the race is deteriorating and not improving. As we shall see later, this is more likely to be a relative rather than an absolute judgment; that is to say, there is more difference between the good twenty per cent and the worst of the rest than there used to be, and many, whom we now consider stupid, would have passed for wise in former times. Still, it is a disquieting thought that our modern industrial machine seems to aim at using more and more of the stupid. It is difficult to imagine that anyone but a stupid person would be content to spend his whole eight-hour working day in placing one screw after another in an endlessly moving belt. If this is the trend of modern industry, it certainly behoves us to see that the one benefit which modern machinery gives, apart from the production of material things, namely more leisure, is used to the very best advantage and that men are given every possible opportunity to use the minds that they possess, if not at work, then at "play."

But the cynic is really short-sighted. He is basing his conclusions on observations of one or two generations. It is only a little over a hundred years since the industrial revolution began and what is that in time?

We must not therefore pay too much attention to the supposed influence of machinery in depressing mental activities. A more cogent argument in favour of pessimism is the assertion that five thousand years ago the Golden Age of Greece produced a group of thinkers equal, if not superior, to any whom we can put forward to-day. Even if this were true, which is very doubtful, the time is still too short. Variations from age to age are bound to occur and "ages" are to be reckoned more in terms of ten thousand years than of five thousand.

A more important argument is this. The exceptional man or even

¹ Plato: *Phaedo*, 66.

² Francis Bacon: *On Truth*.

the exceptional group of men are not necessarily in the long run of great significance. Ancient Greece, the Renaissance, and perhaps the eighteenth century all produced their group of brilliant scholars, but that group was small.

"We do not know that there are any individuals now living who are superior in organic potentialities to the best individuals who have lived in the past. On the other hand it is very possible that great changes have taken place in the relative proportions of the superior and inferior, either over the whole population of the globe or in its local distribution."¹

What really matters are the numbers of really good intellects, not the emergence of the few. To answer the question as to whether intelligence has improved or not, we would want to know whether there are more people at the present day of, say, good university standard, than there were in the days of the Tudors or in the time of the Greek Republics. This is not the place to discuss this in great detail, but the answer is almost certainly yes, and we can look for confirmation in the increased competition in all kinds of examinations. As Childe says when discussing the lack of justification for pessimism in relation to progress in modern times:

"The evils cannot be seen in their true perspective for lack of standards of comparison. . . . Even in the artisan classes, while we know a good deal about the guilds of urban artisans—really a relatively small and privileged class—we dare not picture faithfully the life of a serf in the middle ages, still less that of a slave in ancient Rome or Greece."²

Similarly, we are fond of quoting Sophocles, Æschylus and Euripides, Plato, Socrates and Aristotle as examples of Greek culture, with the implication that there were plenty more like them. If there had been a really large number of super-intellectuals, would we not have heard a great deal more about them?

However brightly the intellectual stars shone, it is extremely doubtful if there were such a large number of good brains then as we have to-day. If Shakespeare outshines all the moderns, that is no proof that Elizabethan intelligence outshone modern intelligence as a whole. Nowadays there are very many of whom we can say:

"But he hath earnestly striven after learning and true wisdom and hath been fully trained and exercised therein, he, if he lay hold on truth must of necessity acquire an immortal and heavenly temper."³

It is submitted that as time goes on clear thinking and the capacity for using logic and reason are possible and increasingly possible for more and more people, though so far not for nearly all the people. An

¹ J. L. Gray: *The Nation's Intelligence*, p. 10.

² G. Childe: *Man Makes Himself*, p. 11.

³ Plato: *Timæus*, 90.

increasing number of people are therefore capable of achieving a fair approximation to Truth, and, through science especially, this approximation is getting closer and closer and therefore bringing them nearer to Deity.¹

The "feeling" of Truth

However, Truth, if it is to be grasped as an abstraction, does not seem to be only a matter of knowing and thinking, it merges into the realm of feeling. We can, it would seem, know true things, but we feel that they are part of Truth.

"Is there such a thing as Rightness or Justice? Is there such a thing as Honour or Goodness? Yet who has ever seen these things with his eyes or apprehended them with any other bodily sense? And the same may be said of innumerable other things. Do we see their true nature by means of our bodily senses? No. We must conceive these things in their abstract form as the true way of understanding."²

We commonly say that we "feel" something is true but then:

"Long before there is an intellectual cognitive approach, there is an affective prehension in feeling."³

So then Truth seems to dissolve itself into Beauty, for the essence of satisfaction in feelings is Beauty. We may not altogether agree with the poet that nothing matters except Beauty, but we may go a very long way in accepting the sentiment that:

"Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty, that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know,"⁴

and the essential "feel" of both Truth and Beauty may be described as their essential fitness.

Beauty and Fitness

Beauty is perhaps even more difficult to define than Truth, for it too is relative, so far as our powers of appreciation have yet been developed, and it is almost impossible to find standards for comparison.

¹ cf. Proverbs iii.

"Happy is the man that findeth wisdom,
And the man that getteth understanding.
For the merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver
And the gain thereof than fine gold;
She is more precious than rubies,
And all the things thou canst desire are not to be compared unto her.
Length of days is in her right hand,
And in her left hand riches and honour.
Her ways are ways of pleasantness
And all her paths are peace.
She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her,
And happy is everyone that retaineth her."

² Plato: *Phaedo*, 27.

³ A. N. Whitehead: *Process and Reality*, p. 72.

⁴ J. Keats: *Ode to a Grecian Urn*.

Truth, we concluded, was more likely to be approached, the more the theory or doctrine fitted the known facts and observations, although, as was found with Newtonian physics, there is always a chance that new facts will be discovered and new observations made, which will prove that the theory which now appears quite true is, in fact, only partially true.

Beauty has also to do with fitness. Ruskin taught that the finest architecture was that which was best fitted to perform its function, but it is not so easy to apply this criterion to a symphony or a sonnet. As a definition, however, we may say that a good symphony or a fine sonnet can be felt to have a rightness, which is much the same thing as fitness.

Some have sought to define as beautiful that which satisfies and appeals to the greatest number and so brings them joy and even happiness. This, however, will not be found to be true if we apply the test only during one cross section of time. The latest dance tune or ballad would probably claim far more adherents among contemporary listeners than would the greatest symphony or concerto. But such success is ephemeral and few would describe these transitory musical hits as truly beautiful, for next week or next month some other tune will have taken the popular favour. Duration through time is not an altogether satisfactory criterion either, for fashions come and go and rediscoveries may be of æsthetic curiosities rather than of works of real genius. For example, the recent phase of appreciation of primitive cave drawings, which are surely older than any other works of art, does not prove that they are thereby shown to be more beautiful than Greek statues or Renaissance pictures.

The truth is that Beauty is largely outside the realm of thought and thinking about it does not take us very far, but it is a matter of feeling, for we have a sense of fitness about a beautiful thing, whether it be music, painting, sculpture or poetry. It gives us a sense of completeness, of harmonious proportion and also a sense of elation and uplift. As Bridges has so admirably put it:

"Beauty is the highest of all these occult influences,
the quality of appearances that thru' the sense
wakeneth spiritual emotion in the mind of man:
And Art, as it createth new forms of beauty,
awakeneth new ideas that advance the spirit
in the life of Reason to the wisdom of God."¹

Beauty and Life

There can be no doubt that Beauty is constantly interacting with human life. It will scarcely be denied that, if a strong sentiment is organized in the personality the sense of beauty and the desire for beauty is intensified. In fact, the stronger the sentiment, if it is of a positive kind the more is this so. This is especially noticeable if the individual is in love. Then appreciation of beauty, whether of poetry, music or art, is intensified,

¹ R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, II, 842-847.

and if there is any aptitude at all for the production or performance of art, it will be brought into play, for it is noticeable how much of the æsthetic activity is directed to the theme of love and how much is produced under the influence of love.¹

Beauty and Love

Love is for many people the most strongly organized sentiment of their lives and is the one which involves the least degree of selfishness. At the highest levels of love the complex of emotions is organized round not one individual, but round the many and involves the conception of something much wider and higher than any one individual. This is the sentiment, which we have called the sentiment of the love of God.

There is considerable evidence to show that when such a sentiment is formed, the appreciation and production of beauty is still further enhanced. This may reach, if we are fortunate enough, even to the point at which we may apprehend Plato's ideal:

"A beauty eternal, not growing or decaying, not waxing or waning; nor will it be fair here and foul there, nor depending on time, or circumstance, or place, as if fair to some and foul to others. Nor shall Beauty appear to him in the likeness of a face or hand, nor embodied in any sort of form whatever . . . whether of heaven or of earth; but Beauty absolute, separate, simple and everlasting; which lending of its virtue to all beautiful things, that we see born to decay, itself suffers neither increase or diminution, nor any other change. When a man, proceeding onwards from terrestrial things by the right way of living, once comes in sight of that Beauty, he is not far from his goal. And this is the right way wherein he should be guided in his love . . . from fair forms to fair conduct and from fair conduct to fair principles, until from fair principles he ultimately arrives at the ultimate principle of all, and learns what absolute beauty is."²

Appreciation of Beauty

Admittedly capacity for the appreciation of beauty is difficult to assess, because of the absence of an exact standard of beauty itself, but

¹ cf. P. B. Shelley: *A Defence of Poetry*.

"The great secret of morals is love: or a going out of our own nature and an identification of ourselves with the beautiful, which exists in thought, action or person not our own. A man to be greatly good must imagine intensely and comprehensively; he must put himself in the place of another and of many others; the pains and pleasures of his species must become his own."

also cf. R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, III, 440-46.

"How Natur (as Plato saith) teacheth man by beauty,
and by the lure of sense leadeth him ever upward
to heav'nly things, and how the mere sensible forms
which first arrest him take on ever more and more
spiritual aspect,—yet discard not nor disown
their sensuous beauty, since thatt is eternal and sure,
the essence thereof being the reverent joy of life—

² Plato: *Symposium*, 211.

we need be no more pessimistic about such aesthetic capacity than we were about intelligence. It certainly does appear that the ancient Greeks had a greater capacity for both the production and appreciation of beauty, except probably in music than we have. This general capacity then apparently died down to revive at even a higher level at the time of the Renaissance. The drab ugliness of our industrial towns, the products of the age of machinery, certainly makes it appear that we are very much in a trough in our own era, but there is plenty of time for a revival. Comparisons must not be made over too short a period of time and certainly 400 or 500 years is too short a period and 5,000 is not any too long.

In creation even in our own time we need not be so very pessimistic, for such a building as the Stockholm Town Hall can stand comparison with almost anything that man has ever built before. Moreover, so far as appreciation is concerned, if we agree that the music of Beethoven is beautiful, it is encouraging to reflect that a programme, which might with difficulty have filled the Queen's Hall not so many years ago, can now fill the Albert Hall to capacity with hundreds turned away.

The fact that the B.B.C. and the gramophone companies have allowed many more people to hear, learn and so appreciate beauty, at any rate in music, certainly supports the argument, for unless people had been capable of appreciation, these would have had no effect.

It is probable that these agencies and the cinematograph might elicit an even greater appreciation of beauty, were it not for the commercialism which demands quick returns and so tends to pander to the short term tastes of those less capable of æsthetic appreciation, who, alas, still constitute the majority of the community. In fine, the number of people who have reached a standard of appreciation of beauty analogous to the full university standard in the realm of intelligence is probably as high or higher than it has ever been and is certainly higher than it was, say, 10,000 or 20,000 years ago, which is the significant interval of time measurement. The more that people can organize a strong, unselfish, forward-looking sentiment, even if it be no higher than the love of an individual—the real love, not merely the lust for a sexual mate—the higher will that appreciation be. If the sentiment is organized within the plan of a high level philosophy of life, the more likely is the sentiment to approach to a true love of God, and the appreciation of beauty rise to its highest level.

“So Breed, from like degrading brutality at heart,
distilleth in the altruism of spiritual love
to be the sublimest passion of humanity,”¹

¹ R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, III, 209-11.

Behaviour and Goodness

Thirdly, what of behaviour? Behaviour will be guided by the plan and driven by the feeling. If the plan be truth and the feeling be beauty, then behaviour will be goodness.

"High art and high morality are closely akin, because they are both but an eager following of the law of beauty."¹

Like Truth and Beauty, Goodness is hard to define because we are not sure of our standards and there is probably no agreement as to what constitutes goodness, either between peoples or from one age to another. Froude, however, was not far wrong in his pithy definition:

"Right, the sacrifice of self to good, wrong, the sacrifice of good to self."²

Nurse Cavell's appeal to humanity, "Patriotism is not enough," would appeal to some and not to others. Patriotism is certainly a virtue:

"That habit which has grown out of the instinct of self-preservation, elevated into a wakeful and affectionate apprehension for the whole, and enobling its private and baser ways by the general use to which they are converted."³

yet Nurse Cavell's statement startled most people, because it did suggest something wider and higher than the average man in the street had so far envisaged. Yet he had always been uncomfortably aware of a sense of divided loyalties, which is a difficulty which from time to time besets us all. It seems hard for us always to remember that:—

"God is good itself, not any one good."⁴

Unselfishness and Service

We all pay lip service to the principle of universal reciprocity, though in time of war it is hard, if not impossible, of application. The cardinal virtues do appear to be unselfishness and uprightness, "Love your Neighbour" and "Love your God" and if there is sufficient uprightness, then there will be unselfishness automatically and vice versa.

"Above all be keen to love one another, for love hides a host of sins. Be hospitable to each other and never grudge it. You must serve one another, each with the talent he has received."⁵

If, then, we all agree, at least in theory, that we ought to work for the greatest good of the greatest number, where does the practice of this precept break down? It probably breaks down because we are not agreed as to what is the greatest good. We are too apt to think exclusively in material terms, and of course we cannot afford to neglect these, but we

¹ A. C. Benson: *Joyous Gard*, p. 36.

² J. Froude: *The Science of History*.

³ W. Wordsworth: *The Convention of Cintra*.

⁴ Plotinus: *Enn*, V, v, 12.

⁵ First Epistle of St. Peter iv, 8-10 (Moffatt translation).

are apt to confine our minds to materialism and to apply the various "goods" out of order and out of proportion.

Health and Goodness

We may certainly agree that it is impossible to have a *mens sana*, and proportionately developed social sense, until man has a *corpus sanum*. Admittedly there have been exceptions to this rule, for we have historical evidence of saints whose bodies have been deformed and diseased, and the more deformed and diseased they have been the more saintly have these people seemed to be. But such saints have often been distinguished for the negative virtues of patience and resignation, rather than for the positive virtues of unselfishness and service for others. Besides, individual instances are bad guides to general applications and, if we are to raise the general standards of good behaviour, so that we may claim, as we have done for intelligence and appreciation of beauty, that there are more people nowadays who live up to a high standard of goodness than there used to be, we must have a more healthy community than we have at present.

The individual must have sufficient food both in quality and variety, he must have sufficient room in his house to assure him fresh air, the opportunity of quietude for at least some part of the day or night, adequate protection from extremes of heat and cold and opportunities for cleanliness.

In his work, everyone must have hygienic conditions; so far as possible he must have work in which he can take an interest, so that it is a pleasure to him and not a burdensome task from which he tries to escape at the earliest possible moment and his hours must be regulated so as to avoid undue fatigue. He should have adequate time for leisure, and the chance to use that leisure in real recreation, not in merely loafing about in order to pass the time.

"There is no saying shocks me so much as that which I hear very often, that a man does not know how to pass his time."¹

The health services, including the medical profession, must direct their energies to the maintenance of health, rather than to the cure of disease. The public at large must become health-minded instead of disease-minded, as they predominantly are at present. Moreover, there must be no preconceived ideas as to the use of leisure for health. It is not everyone who likes or benefits from formal physical exercises or from organized games or from any other particular fad or fashion. Tastes differ and individual enterprise should be given a chance to show itself.

The Prerequisites for Goodness

Given a healthy body and a sanitary and congenial environment in which to live and work and play, there is a chance for the healthy

¹ Abraham Cowley: *Essays of Solitude*.

mind to develop, and achieve goodness in behaviour. The individual must then be given a chance to develop his intellectual capacities. He must be taught how to think, so that he can formulate an adequate philosophy of life, not at the bidding of someone else, blindly following a leader, who for all he knows may be as blind as himself, but choosing openly and critically the plan which seems best to him and most likely to lead him to Truth, Beauty and Goodness.

“Goodness, though an indispensable adjunct to knowledge, is no substitute for it.”¹

Such a plan, as we have seen, may be similar or identical with that laid down by an orthodox body to which he adheres, but the important point is that he should freely adhere and be under no compulsion in doing so. It may be that outside impulses do, in fact, impel him to the choice of his philosophy, but he should, if possible, recognize that he is being so impelled and these impulses should act through him, undergoing their reorganization and integration in his own mind.

Next he must be given an opportunity to appreciate beauty, the beauties of nature, the beauties of art and the fitness of things and people.

“For the absolute good is the cause and source of all beauty.”²

The Chances for Good Behaviour

How far we are from affording to the average citizen such opportunities is seen every day in the essential ugliness of much of the world, especially as it is modified by man. But it is not only the works of man which are ugly, nature herself is not by any means always beautiful and man has done much to improve nature and to enhance her beauty. Surely this is a sign of grace.

When we afford such opportunities for these human activities which promote the evolution of goodness in others, we are surely developing goodness in ourselves. In as much as there is a greater tendency to afford these opportunities than there used to be, as we shall show in greater detail later on, we may claim that our own day does show an advance in Goodness, just as it does in Truth and Beauty.

In such a setting as we have described, there is at least a chance for man to achieve goodness in his behaviour. But it must be a positive goodness, not as the oriental would have it, a mere negative avoidance of sin. For this positive goodness man cannot live alone, he must mix with his fellows and have every possible opportunity for social intercourse, for it is only by interaction with others that man completes his personality.

“It is not enough to know about virtue, but we must endeavour to possess it and use it, or to take any other steps that may make us good.”³

¹ J. Froude: *Reformation and Scottish Character*.

² Plotinus: *Enn*, VI, 9, 4.

³ Aristotle: *Ethics*.

The Necessity for Love

To this end, it would certainly appear (though the Christian doctrine does not seem to think that sexual love is necessary and some of those who pretend to be its exponents regard it as actually harmful) that man must have love, intimate love in his own life, love of parents, love of relations, but above all the love of his mate. Comte well summarised the objects of love:

"Self-love.

Conjugal love, necessarily a close bond.

Children—parent love, contact with the past
 Parent—children love, contact with the future } continuity.

Fraternal love—solidarity.

Love of Domestics—Social love."¹

It is only through personal love that man can be ennobled to that forgetfulness of self, whereby he can achieve the goodness of behaviour involved in the enactment of the conduct determined by the sentiment of the love of God. With this to help him, he can achieve a level of goodness superior to anything that has gone before.

"When the soul by good fortune reaches that Goodness, or rather, when that Goodness appears and approaches the soul . . . then she suddenly sees Goodness or God within herself."²

That any large number of people have achieved such a standard of goodness is difficult to say. With a universal war so recently in progress it certainly looked as if we were in a trough in respect of goodness, just as we seemed to be in respect of beauty. This correspondence between beauty and goodness, after all, is only to be expected, for feeling and doing, affection and conation, are most intimately connected. But if we are still under the influence of war now, taken over a period of time, even say as small as a century, the general level of goodness is certainly higher than it used to be.

¹ A. Comte: *A General View of Positivism*.

² Plotinus: *Enn*, VI, vii, 34.

THE PROGRESS TO HARMONY

The Product of Truth, Beauty and Goodness

To recapitulate the present position of our argument; if we accept the statement that Truth, Beauty and Goodness are at once the inspiration and the product at their highest level of the three aspects of our mental life, we must consider to what they are all pointing. By themselves they are not necessarily enough, as has already been said:

“So long as the self retains initiative it can only fix itself upon itself as centre. Its hope of deliverance is to be uprooted from that centre and drawn to find its centre in God, the Spirit of the Whole. Towards this it is brought by all in which the Spirit of the Whole is manifest as such by Truth, Beauty and Goodness. None of these is always capable of an all-pervasive influence. The scientist who labours devotedly in the service of truth is sometimes very jealous about the credit for his discoveries; the artist who is true to his own ideals of beauty is not always generous in his appreciation of other artists; the philanthropist who sacrifices ease and comfort in a life of service is sometimes extremely self-willed as regards the kind of service which he or she shall render; and anyone of these may be an exacting member of the home circle.”¹

We have assumed that the criterion of all these goals is fitness or widespread adjustment. If we accept the pragmatism of William James, as a provisional step in philosophic progress, our nearest approach to Truth will be a formulation of ideas, which will fit all observed facts, in as simple terms as possible; so far this seems to have been borne out by experience. Thus, as we have seen, in the field of mathematical astronomy, Einstein's theory at present represents our closest approach to Truth, but we cannot be certain that this theory represents absolute Truth in respect of the relationships of the universe, since improved methods of observation and measurement may reveal other facts, which do not fit in with the Einsteinian theory.

To our superior attitude, it may now seem absurd that the leaders of human thought of their age should have accepted such a naïve doctrine as that the earth is flat, which now seems so palpably false, even to the elementary schoolboy, but we ought to be sufficiently humble to admit that at some future age, perhaps many hundreds or thousands of years hence, the elementary schoolboy may be equally scornful of our much-vaunted Einsteinian theory of the universe, which to-day seems such a highlight of human wisdom and an acceptable framework into

¹ W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 376.

which all facts fit. We ought also to take into account the fact that, having regard for the immense stretch of time involved, we cannot be absolutely certain that a theory which represented Truth now would necessarily represent Truth then, for the universe is not static, as is indicated by the latest researches in mathematical physics.

So far, in our discussion of Truth, we have confined ourselves to these things which can be closely observed and accurately measured, but this does not include the sum total of our experiences, a point which will have to be discussed at greater length presently.

In addition to measurable experience as apprehended by our intelligence, there are all the imponderables, quality, value and the like, for which we have no exact instruments of measurement. These are part of Truth, but are apprehended by our feelings, by the emotions which they evoke, much more than by the exercise of our intelligence.

Intelligence and its Measurement

If for the most part Truth is grasped by our intelligence how do we define and measure intelligence? It is a property of the mind which has been intensively studied and it can be measured with a considerable degree of accuracy by contrasting individual findings with an established norm. It is possible to devise a battery of tests of intelligence and of performance requiring intelligence, which can be readily given to large numbers of people of all ages, all races and all civilizations, and to devise from these tests percentile curves showing the capacities of any members of the various groups. We can establish norms and so express in terms of percentages the intelligence of any individual of any group.

In devising these batteries it is obvious that they should be capable of determining not what the subject has learnt, but what he is capable of learning. Thus the great variations in the opportunities of acquiring knowledge can be obviated.

It must be admitted that the perfect battery of tests has not yet been evolved, but sufficient progress has been made to enable us to estimate the present level of human intelligence in a broad way and to have at least a rough idea of what goes to make up intelligence.

For intelligence the subject must be capable of receiving messages from the outside world, chiefly, but not exclusively, by the sense organs of sight and hearing, in other words he must be capable of noticing things. Next, he must be able to remember what he has noticed. He must then be able to appreciate differences and similarities and, by comparing one sense impression with another, he attaches meaning, as we say, to these impressions. He perceives what he has seen, heard or touched.

Once he is capable of attaching meanings, the way is open for the further combinations and permutations of sense impressions and perceptions, which lead to abstractions and the formation of grouped perceptions and what are called concepts. This means that he enjoys the power to form general laws from particular instances, which is

inductive logic or, conversely, the power to anticipate what will be true of the individual instance from the general law, which is deductive logic. This power of reasoning from the particular to the general simplifies masses of perceived material and enables the subject to arrive at a greater measure of truth relating to them. This desirable result, however, will be misleading, unless at the same time there is increased power of discrimination and appreciation of differences. For example, a large number of the living things which swim in water are fish, but it would be fallacious to argue from this that all aquatic living things were fish; for, if in the course of our examination, we study these aquatic animals more carefully, we find that certain of them, such as the whale, have other characteristics, which we associate with a different group of animals called mammals; others, such as the newt, with a group we call amphibians, and others again, such as the water beetle, with a group of insects.

The real point in advance from the perception of a mass of individual instances to the conception of a general law, is the capacity to recognize the significance of the various details which we perceive. This brings us back to the factors operative in the recognition of Truth. Measurement is not the whole story; feeling also comes into the picture in the form of a sense of rightness, fitness or significance.

The Appreciation of the Fitness of Things

Reason is the manipulation of facts as observed, whether by induction from particulars to generals, or by deductions from general propositions to particular examples as in geometry or algebra. The recognition of significance, however, involves something more, which we sometimes refer to as intuition. After all the facts have been collected by our senses and perceptions are marshalled into their proper order by reason, there is a sort of "click" in the mind, often while the subject is in a state of reverie, which gives a conviction of rightness. As when Kékulé, musing on the top of a bus, thinking idly of the carbohydrate molecules, suddenly saw them as an endless chain, the snake biting its own tail, and evolved the conception of the benzene ring, which was the start of such enormous advances in organic chemistry.

This feeling of rightness or fitness, then, belongs more to the affective than to the cognitive field, to Beauty, which is the complement of Truth, for the discovery of the benzene ring had something of true beauty about it just because it fitted so well. We must realize, therefore, that Truth and Beauty cannot be kept in strict pigeon-holes, but they merge into each other, until Truth is Beauty and Beauty is Truth, as Keats has said. Indeed, the qualities and faculties of man are by no means easily distinguished:

"Man's spiritual nature, the vital force which dwells in him, is essentially one and indivisible, that what we call imagination, fancy, understanding and so forth, are but different figures of the same power of insight, all indissolubly connected with each other, physiognomic-

ally related, that if we know one of them we might know all of them. Morality itself, what we call the moral quality of a man, what is this but another side of the one vital force, whereby he is and works. All that man does is physiognomical of him. You would see how a man would fight by the way in which he sings, his courage or want of courage is visible in the word he utters, in the opinion he has formed, no less than in the stroke he strikes. He is one and preaches the same self abroad in all these ways."¹

Æsthetic Appreciation

The feeling of fitness which we have in relation to the benzene ring as a conception which fits the facts, or to the physics of Einstein, which explains the universe, both of which have been so productive in the advancement of knowledge, is closely allied to the feeling of the composer who suddenly sees the fitness of a combination of harmonies, which will make a beautiful symphony. Similarly, the poet sees the same sort of fitness in his arrangement of words and of feelings expressed in words, which go to make the beautiful sonnet, and so do the painter and the sculptor, whose designs of form and colour make the beautiful work of art.

The work of art will, in fact, fall short of perfection, unless it not only expresses beauty, but also conveys ideas, which is another way of saying there is no Truth without Beauty and no Beauty without Truth.

The true significance and value of knowledge then, involves the factor of beauty as well as that of truth. Man has sought to estimate the power of appreciating beauty just as he has measured the capacity for acquiring knowledge. As has already been said, the difficulty in the quest is to establish any sort of standard. It has been generally agreed that certain simple relationships are more generally pleasing than others, generally of a more complicated form. Thus certain intervals in the combination of notes are recognized as producing harmony, which is admitted as beautiful, while others produce discord, which is generally held to be ugly. The same applies to metre in poetry and to form and colour in art. So far as architecture is concerned, for example, the truly beautiful relationships, such as the classical form, the rounded and the pointed arch, are so simple, that they were all appreciated and put into use long ago, with very satisfactory results. All that can be done now is to try and find new and if possible better variations of the old theme.

Progress in Artistic Expression

The more enterprising and independent minds in the artistic world are naturally averse to being bound by old forms and are always striving to find new relationships, which will give that feeling of rightness and fitness which is associated with beauty. In every age we have "moderns" who make the attempt to break away from the traditional simplicities, but who as a rule produce discords rather than harmonies.

¹ T. Carlyle: *The Hero as Poet*.

The artists themselves and the particular coterie which they succeed in establishing round themselves, profess to see beauty in these discords, but as a rule this is a protest of obstinacy, rather than a conviction of truth and the bizarre schools quickly fall into disrepute and well-merited oblivion.

It does not follow, however, that there can be no further development of art, for just as two-dimensional art gave place to three-dimensional representation, the first essays in which must have appeared bizarre and ugly to contemporaries, so some modern workers are, as part of their plan of new expression, endeavouring to incorporate a fourth dimension, that of time, in their presentation. Perhaps music and poetry have already mastered the time dimension, so that they can convey a sense of rightness and fitness, which is applicable to and expressive of any place and any time. Such a sonnet as:

"Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?

Thou art more lovely and more temperate. . . ."¹

is not only immortal in itself, but voices the song of all lovers of all times. Of such quality too are the great symphonies and much of the greatest chamber music, but the plastic arts seem to be behind in this respect, though some Greek statuary and such pictures as the *Mona Lisa* not only seem to give satisfaction throughout the ages, but also to express, one the spirit of eternal youth and the other the changing moods of women in response to every joy and every sorrow of life, gathered together into one ever-changing, but ever static face. The upward and outward urge of the *Nike*, the divine harmony of design of the *Spozialitza* or the great fresco depicting the *Last Supper* are of all time and beyond all time and, therefore, may satisfy the demands of beauty in all dimensions.

We can, therefore, do a little to measure an individual's capacity for appreciating beauty and his ability to detect harmony and distinguish it from discord, by testing his judgment on universally accepted beautiful works of art. Nevertheless, æsthetic testing is in its infancy, because there is not sufficient stability in the standards on which such tests can be based. Since there is so much individuality in judgments of beauty, it may be that we shall never be able to reach the exactitude of measurement which is possible when dealing with intelligence, but that is for the future to determine.

Adjustment to Life

Beauty and the conception of beauty must not, however, be confined by definition to the products of man's æsthetic talents, or even to the harmonics with which nature so liberally surrounds us. Perhaps the most important aspect of beauty is the beauty we display in living our own lives and in our power of adjustment to life. Truth, Beauty and Goodness lead to harmony and for harmony stability co-ordinating with a capacity for adjustment is essential.

¹ W. Shakespeare: *Sonnet 18*.

The measurement of this latter "faculty" is even less exact than that of the others which we have discussed, but its elucidation is much to be desired. Intelligence is only a very partial indication of this power of adjustment. It is true that those with a very limited degree of intelligence have a very limited power of adjustment to life, but it is also true that some people with a very high degree of intelligence have a very poor power of adjustment, for the eccentric genius is a common figure of fun. To use intelligence to achieve a good adjustment is to be wise:

"To know wisdom and instruction;
To perceive the words of understanding;
To receive the instruction of wisdom.
Justice and judgment, and equity;
To give subtilty to the simple,
To the young man knowledge and discretion,
That the wise man may hear, and may increase learning;
And that the man of understanding may attain unto wise counsels."¹

Whether the correlation holds at all, however, and if so how far it can be depended upon, is less certain, for, although it appears that many people of only moderate intelligence adjust to life, with every appearance of success, the level of life to which they adjust is not generally very high. It is probably true that if people are really going to adjust to life at its highest levels they require a high degree of intelligence, which is another way of saying that if people are going to achieve beauty in life they must be capable of forming a high philosophy of life to serve them as their guide.

"If our civilization is in danger it is partly because many highly intelligent persons have not learnt the necessity of good intellectual habits or have inherited a social tradition which precludes them from accepting them."²

In fact, no one without a high capacity for intellectual development will be able to make a satisfactory adjustment to any and every sort of environment which he may be called upon to meet.

"Our stability is but balance, and wisdom lies
in masterful administration of the unforeseen."³

Failure in Adjustment

This problem of adjustment is bound up with the problem of mental illness in its widest sense and those who fail to adjust will be found to be those who are suffering from some form and some degree of mental illness, even though neither they nor their friends would ever describe them as ill. Some people cannot adjust to life because they have not the innate capacity to do so. These are the backward people of varying degrees, a group which in its lowest ranges includes the mental defectives.

¹ Proverbs i.

² J. L. Gray: *The Nation's Intelligence*, p. 82.

³ R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, I, 6-7.

It might possibly be a good plan if some term could be invented to include not only the intellectually defectives but also those who are defective in affective capacity and in the capacity for successful adjustment to life. Such a term would include many people who are potentially or actually insane, as well as a certain number of those who are usually described as psychoneurotic and psychopathic personalities. The difficulty of such an extension of terms, which are generally used in a different connotation, is that it leads to confusion. Yet innate defect is responsible for the failure in adjustment in many people such as the schizophrenics and cyclics, who may start life with every prospect of success.

How far this innate factor can ever be excluded in any case of failure of adjustment to life is doubtful, for, in fact, no human being is capable of perfect adjustment in every conceivable circumstance of life, or he would not be human. Nevertheless, there can be no question that for many people circumstances may be so difficult that the emphasis in the genesis of their maladjustment is on the environment rather than on themselves.

The Slings and Arrows of Outrageous Fortune

The strokes of fortune, delivered from the environment, are not as a rule single, but in series. In any given case it may appear that some single event has so shaken the stability of the individual that he can never, or only with the greatest difficulty, recover his poise, but as a rule, if careful inquiry is made, it is found that there have been a series of similar or analogous events, which have, one after the other, pushed him a little further over the edge of stability and so altered his attitude towards life and his feeling of security that he no longer has the confidence in himself to make the effort required. The difficulty of grading the capacity for adjustment is increased by the fact that different people vary so much in their power of adaptation to different events and situations. What is easy for one is apparently well-nigh impossible for another, and it is not easy to predict what anyone's reaction will be to a complete change in the environment, or even to what may appear to be a relatively simple alteration. This is well seen under war conditions, when people who have seemed intensely neurotic in peace-time do unexpectedly well in the services, perhaps because they find it easier to live within a closely organized community, without much individual responsibility, even though exposed to serious outside dangers, than to undertake isolated action without mutual support. Others again, who have cheerfully shouldered responsibilities or shown commendable moral courage in the execution of their work, cannot stand up to the threat of physical danger on the one hand, or the continual publicity of life as it is lived in a community on the other.

With two such variables as individual constitution and temperament and the very varied environment in which such an individual may find himself, any statistically valid coefficient of stability is going to be very

difficult to establish, but that a plastic stability is desirable cannot be doubted. Mere rigid stability is of very little use in modern conditions, where rigid conservatism is hopelessly left behind by the march of events, but too great originality and ability is also of little value in the turmoil, as such a person is too much swept by every current and cannot find an anchorage anywhere.

The Ideal of Adjustment

This plastic stability and reasonably adequate adjustment to life would mean that it could be met without fear, without anger, without interfering curiosity and without sentimentality. Nevertheless it would not do for these feelings to be left out of us entirely, for it should be noticed that all these emotions, although they should not be exhibited in their primitive and uncontrolled form, do enter into virtues which are eminently desirable in the perfectly adjusted individual.

"All admit that in a certain sense the several sorts of character are bestowed by nature. Justice, a tendency to temperance, courage and the other types of character are exhibited from the moment of birth. Nevertheless, we look for developed goodness as something different from this and expect to find these same qualities in another form. For even in children and brutes these natural virtues are present, but without the guidance of reason (intellect) they are plainly hurtful. . . . When it (natural virtue) is enlightened by reason (intellect) it acts surprisingly well; and the natural virtue (which before was only like virtue) will then be fully developed virtue."¹

The "virtuous" man must be prudent, and prudence involves completely regulated and controlled fear. He must be capable of indignation at injustices or cruelty and this involves co-ordinated anger. He must be interested in his environment and be concerned with the welfare of his fellow mortals, and show a kindness towards all living things and this involves a curiosity and a tender feeling well adjusted both in quality and quantity to the circumstances of the situation. Such a character, made up of well regulated virtues and free from all uncontrolled vices, is hardly to be expected in the present stage of human development, but if such a man did exist he must have some happiness:

"Virtue itself and the joy and glory of virtue, and the life that is subject to no grief and no master, are enough to make happy those that have set themselves to live according to virtue and have achieved it."²

Surely his life would be regarded as beautiful and would, in fact, be organized within the sentiment of the love of God which, as we have already seen, includes the love of one's neighbour.

¹ Aristotle: *Ethics*.

² Sallustius (the companion and adviser of Julian the Apostate): *The Gods and the World*.

"The more that men have this thirst for beauty, for serene energy, for fullness of life, the higher they are in the scale and the less will they quarrel with the obscurity and the humility of their lives, because they are confidently waiting for a purer, higher, more untroubled life, to which we are all on our way, whether we realise it or not."¹

The person who has evolved a philosophy of life approaching Truth and whose emotional life is so organised that there is a plastic, and so far as possible, a frictionless adjustment to the environment, coloured by a capacity for the appreciation of beauty and a real experience of love, will certainly wish to be good and will, in all probability, achieve goodness in his behaviour.

The Measurement of Goodness

The trouble again is that there is so much confusion in the definition of goodness that the "science" of Ethics finds it as difficult to establish standards as does that of Æsthetics. This being so, it would seem that neither Ethics nor Æsthetics are yet worthy to be classed as sciences. Historically, there is no question but that throughout the ages what has been thought of as goodness at one time has been regarded as evil at another and what is approved of by one tribe is disapproved of by another.

Can we, by reference to the cognitive aspect of Truth and the affective aspect of Beauty, arrive at any conception of Goodness? Truth involves sincerity and honesty. There must be no reservations of opinions or double meanings. Beauty involves love and kindness and the actions of the good man must not only have the negative merit of making no man weep, but must have the positive value of making as many as possible rejoice. He must rejoice, moreover, in the happiness of himself and others and not in the malicious feeling of superiority over others less fortunate than himself. His whole behaviour must be directed towards the benefit of the greatest number of his fellow mortals and eventually of all mankind, for certainly patriotism is not enough and indeed may have proved to be the crowning evil of our age.

The Nazis were certainly patriotic but they were as certainly evil. It may be interesting to note, however, that this failure to have a wide enough vision, is not the special characteristic of our so-called degenerate days. Even in the much vaunted times of Ancient Greece, it was said of the Greek commonwealths:

"There appears to be no idea that a city had any responsibility for the moral effects of its actions, except to its own citizens. Except in certain heretical tendencies of thought, there seems little or no idea of a duty towards humanity, for which the particular city was only an instrument."²

After all, the restriction of kindness to our own race and the insistence

¹ A. C. Benson: *Joyous Gard*.

² G. C. Field: *Plato and His Contemporaries*.

that we shall be the *Herrenvolk*, who shall exploit all others, is the chief basis of war.

The fact is, then, that we have not advanced far enough to establish any exact standards, much less any reliable tests of Goodness and we must be content to work on a general impression of a man's goodness and not on any exact measurable scale.

The Goal of Harmony

If this is as far as we can get towards a definition and a means of estimating Truth, Beauty and Goodness and man's capacity to reach out to them, can we get any further by considering towards what they are all tending? If Truth, Beauty and Goodness could be achieved by everyone then the whole of life would be harmonious, for if all were truth there would be no falsehood, and no difference of opinion, at least on essentials. If all were beauty, there would be no ugliness, no envy, hatred or malice, no uncharitableness and no conflicting emotions to cause anxiety, no panic fear or unbridled wrath. If all were good, then there would be no cruelty and certainly no war. In fact, we should reach a state of harmony and:

"L'harmonie ne cherche rien en dehors d'elle même. Elle est ce qu'elle doit être: elle exprime le bien, l'ordre, la loi, le vrai; elle est supérieure au temps et représente l'éternel."¹

To some people such harmony might seem dull, for they would say that much wit and even much art and much of the spice of life depend on many of the ideas, emotions and wishes, which are here deprecated. But this is not a matter upon which we can pass judgment in the present state of our experience, for we have not even begun to approach a state of real harmony and therefore can have no true conception of what it means. We can realize, at least, that it would be good to be rid of the evils and we do not yet know what the good, unspoiled by evil, really is. But if we look to those in whom we seem to discern some sort of power of grasping an existence beyond our own, the poets and the mystics, then their visions seem to tell us of a state of peace, harmony and simplicity. But such simplicity need not in any sense be empty, given all aspects of our vision, for it is the simplicity of the whole and not of the part and surely interest will not be lacking if the whole field of knowledge is open to our contemplation and emotionally we can hardly be dull if real beauty in all its aspects is at our disposal.

Certainly we come nearest to ecstasy, when we listen to a great symphony, when we read or hear a perfectly balanced poem, whether in prose or verse, when we look upon a great work of art, whether painted by man or nature, if we have any power of appreciation at all. And this ecstasy is enhanced a thousandfold if we can share these beauties with even one person whom we truly love, and this feeling of love has got to

¹ Amiel ii, 108.

be extended out of all present recognition. Now most people feel that this ecstatic feeling is only possible in company with one other person:

"Dear friend, knows't thou not
That the only truth in the world
Is what one heart telleth another
In speechless greetings of love."¹

But this will not necessarily be the case in the future. Even now most people agree that this ecstatic sharing of beauty with the person we love has little to do with the uncomplicated sexual mating instinct, which nevertheless has played a part, and an important part, both in drawing us together and in keeping us together. Therefore, with wider capacities and opportunities of mental love, this ecstasy in beauty may well be shared, not only with one, but with many and this wide sympathy may increase enjoyment beyond anything of which we can at present conceive.

"And the more people on high have that accord,
The more to love well are there, the more love is,
And mirror-like 'tis given and restored."²

The Range of Harmony

Then our behaviour will surely be a satisfaction to ourselves, as well as others, for we shall be living our lives to the full, which will mean an infinite variety to match an infinite capacity. Nor is it necessary to envisage restrictions of what have been called the "animal pleasures." There is no question that intense pleasure can be gained at the appetite level, but the puritan teaching has been that such appetites are always evil. This teaching was due, however, to the fact that, if behaviour at this level is uncontrolled and ill-regulated, it tends to be self-centred and to react to the detriment of others, owing to our selfishness in snatching at pleasure exclusively for ourselves. But if our behaviour is completely controlled and properly regulated, then we can fully enjoy ourselves and no one else will be harmed.

Why should we not enjoy our food, provided no one else goes hungry? So long as we know how to moderate our behaviour so that none are made to weep no harm can be done. Why should we not enjoy our sexual behaviour, provided that others are not hurt thereby and our partner derives as much pleasure and joy from the experience as we do ourselves? In our state of harmony there would be no room and no cause for jealousy, because everything would be known and understood and our lust, if it could still be called so, would always be so tempered and controlled that it brought joy only and not sorrow.

A great deal of unhappiness and misunderstanding could be avoided if people realized that these primitive pleasures are not inherently wrong in themselves. They have only got such a bad name, because if they are used simply for the gratification of the self, they are more apt to produce

¹ Vladimir Solovov.

² cf. Dante: *Purgatorio* XV, 1, 74 (Binyon translation).

harm to and unhappiness in others than the more complex pleasures which, from their very nature, require more co-operation with other people and therefore do not so easily lend themselves to selfish motives.

The False Prohibitions of Sexual Enjoyment

The sexual impulse has had a specially bad repute in this respect and has come to be associated with an almost inevitable sense of guilt, not only in civilized races, but in primitive peoples as well. The sense of guilt is, of course, not inherent, but has been well ingrained in the social heritage, the traditional folk-lore, which has been handed down from generation to generation and is now an almost axiomatic assumption. There are many explanations for this, but the most important is probably that this act, which gives intense pleasure to the individual, does require the co-operation of another person, who, if the act is performed for selfish ends only, may be coerced in such a way as to inflict considerable mental and bodily suffering and distress.

There is also possible harm to the child who is the product of the union, in at least a certain number of cases, which helps to determine the sense of guilt, for the taboo dated from long before the age of scientific birth control. Furthermore, in the days when the family was a much more important economic self-contained unit than it is to-day, sexual irregularities were, or might be, detrimental to the patriarchal or matriarchal control, and were therefore frowned upon.

No doubt these were the origins of the taboo against sex which developed to such an absurd extent amongst the more puritanical sects of the Christian Church, till not only was all direct sexual pleasure prohibited, except within the strict confines of marriage legitimized by the Church, but every form of pleasure was held to be sinful, from music, dancing and the drama (since these were supposed necessarily to have a direct sexual connotation) even to the most innocent games and relaxations. Such restrictions of normal pleasure often led to the transformation of sexual relationships within marriage, from being mutually happy fulfilments of normal love, to compulsive acts made bitter by the overwhelming sense of guilt. This latter reaction was well brought out in the character of Mr. Barrett in *The Barretts of Wimpole Street*. The appalling self-consciousness, dishonesty, shame and guilt, associated with sex in modern times is a serious reflection on religious influence, indeed on civilization itself, and one of the tasks of future social progress must be to resolve this dreadful individual and social tangle.

We ought to have no doubt that:

"Love when real ever desires light, in order to attain its ends. The influence of true feeling is as favourable to sound thought as to wise activity."¹

It was not only amongst the puritans, who were the product of the Protestant Reformation, that the terrible inhibitions on sex were to be

¹ A. Comte: *A General View of Positivism*, p. 21.

met with, for in all the early Christian communities, and amongst the devotees of other religions as well, celibacy was especially extolled as a virtue, and there seemed to be a fixed idea that sexual love must be directly antithetic to the love of God. Constantly in religious literature the contrast between sacred and profane love was stressed and the attitude tended to be that since the race must be perpetuated, the functions necessary to ensure this end must be reluctantly permitted, but only when hedged round by the most rigid restrictions. The unfortunate dictum of St. Paul, "It is better to marry than to burn," though probably not meant in the sense in which it has been so commonly interpreted, has given rise to a horrible load of human misery.

If human love is to be interpreted only in the sense of selfish lust, no doubt this taboo may be justified, but at its best, as the highest form of mutual aid in human experience, surely it is part of and reflective of the love of God.

"The darkness is passing away and the true light is already shining. He who says he is in the light and hates his brother is in darkness still. He who loves his brother remains in the light."¹

The Harmony of Love

It is submitted, therefore, that the harmonious evolution of human experience and behaviour is promoted by and through love—not an emasculated symbolic and ephemeral love of God—but through the full-blooded, unselfish human love of mate and friend, such as Shakespeare knew and wrote about, not as something strange or shameful, but as a natural and inevitable part of human existence, through which indeed the human being might rise to his greatest height.² As John Donne, that great divine and great lover has it:

"Only our love hath no decay,
This no to-morrow hath, nor yesterday,
Running, it never runs from us away,
But truly keeps his first, last, everlasting day."³

So far in the development of the human race, it would seem that man is only capable of this full and overwhelming feeling for one individual, at least at one and the same time, but with a higher development of the human race such a relationship might well be possible with many and even eventually with all. Such an idea is difficult for us now with our jealousy-ridden minds, but if we could altogether get rid of jealousy such a conception is not beyond the imagination. Whether

¹ First Epistle of St. John ii, 8-10 (Moffatt translation).

² cf. W. Blake: *The Clod and the Pebble*.

"Love seeketh not itself to please
Nor for itself hath any care
But for another gives its ease,
And builds a heaven in hell's despair."

³ John Donne: *The Anniversary*.

such a universal love could or could not be accompanied by the pleasures of physical union is a question which cannot be answered at present, for we must admit we do not even begin to understand what full universal love means.

At our present level it is probably correct to say that it could not, but if we advanced to such a state of harmony, in which all envy, hatred, malice and jealousy were abolished, who is to tell what might or might not be possible and what form our love would take. Physical love is, at its best, a fulfilment and expression of perfect love and trust, perhaps an essential expression of this if it is to reach its complete fulfilment, but it is by no means the whole story. In the future it may be incidental and simply a means to the end of procreation and continuance of the race, or it may emerge in a way which we cannot now envisage, as a greater fulfilment, a wider field of feeling, of which at present we have no more than an uncertain and glimmering understanding. Admittedly:

"So long as disharmonies exist in the personality and conflicts arise between different tendencies in it, so long the personality will fall below its ideal of a pure homogeneous whole; that ideal will only be attained when, in the progress of personal development, harmony and internal peace have been secured. It must not be supposed that the only manner in which this peace is possible is by the elimination or absorption of all the lower or earlier phases of personal evolution and the survival of the later higher phases. The ideal man will not be devoid of these passions and emotions which ordinarily war against the higher tendencies and aspirations of the personality. But in the ideal man they will not cause conflict by contending for a dominating position in the personality; they will be relegated to the subordinate position to which their more primitive crude character entitles them. In the ideal man the discords of ethical life will be composed, because there will be harmonious correlation of higher and lower; the harmony will be the richer in proportion to the variety of elements which have been conserved and will thus combine to produce it."¹

Still we have our virtues even now, we are beginning to realize how to give to others and how to appreciate goodness in others, we know that:

"For the most part, he who receives is inferior to him who gives; and hence God is above all, because he is above all the great giver and the gifts of men cannot be equal to those of God, for there, is an infinite distance between them, and the narrowness and insufficiency of the gifts of men is eked out by gratitude."²

So, we must develop ourselves to the highest level of which we are capable, and, as we shall see, we may now take a hand ourselves in bringing about that development. Thus our intelligence, our power of creating and appreciating beauty, and through our love for others our

¹ J. Smuts: *Holism and Evolution*, p. 309.

² Cervantes: *Don Quixote*.

service to the community, rise to the highest possible level. Then we may go far towards that harmony, which is another name for love which leads to happiness, even within measurable time and eventually attain to the quality of Deity, which is our ultimate aim. Till, in fact,

“The virtue of love hath pacified
Our will; we long for what we have alone
Nor any craving stirs in us besides.”¹

¹ Dante: *Paradiso*, III, 70 (Laurence Binyon translation).

HAPPINESS AND DEITY

Happiness Emerges from Harmony

Harmony, then, is the emergent product of Truth, Beauty and Goodness. For the individual, as Democritus said nearly three thousand years ago, "The chief end is a contented mind," and a contented mind is in harmony with itself and its environment. To enjoy a contented mind is to enjoy happiness. Happiness is the potential product and reward of ordinary human life at its best,¹ and yet it is something more. The pleasure of life has emerged and developed into something wider and higher:

"Happiness which all seek is not composable
of any summation of particular pleasures;"²

Happiness involves harmony and is incompatible with any sort of conflict.

"All unhappiness depends upon some kind of disintegration or lack of integration: there is lack of integration within the self, through lack of co-ordination between the conscious and the unconscious mind; there is lack of co-ordination between the self and society, where the two are not knit together by the force of objective interests and affections. The happy man is the man who does not suffer from either of these failures of unity. Whose personality is neither divided against itself or pitted against the world. Such a man feels himself a citizen of the universe, enjoying freely the spectacle that it offers and the joys that it affords; untroubled by the thought of death, because he feels himself not really separate from those who will come after him. It is in such profound instinctive union with the stream of life, that the greatest joy is to be found."³

Absolute Happiness an Abstract Ideal

We have tried to picture the advance of perfect man towards happiness. We may call such a perfect man a saint if we like, but we ought not to envisage the saint as a religious ascetic or an impractical mystic, for as Powis says:

"It is a great mistake to think that the condition of being a saint depends on any definite religious belief . . . it does not at all imply

¹ cf. R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, IV, 533-537.

"The name of happiness is but a wider term
for the unalloy'd conditions of the Pleasur of Life,
attendant on all function, and not to be deny'd
to th' soul, unless forsooth in our thought of nature
spiritual is by definition unnatural."

² *Ibid.*, III, 850-51.

³ B. Russell: *The Conquest of Happiness*.

any rigid morality. The saint is one who holds the view that, compared with happiness, nothing is of any importance at all."¹

To some this conception of absolute happiness is uninteresting, as being without contrasts, without the thrills which we get from constant effort, from the ups and downs of life; but such people are like the Stoics, who could only explain evil as expressly created to enhance the beauty of moral heroism by contrast and conflict. But being human we really know very little about happiness, just as we know very little about any of the higher abstractions. Our glimpses are so momentary that we cannot judge; yet again to quote Powis:

"Side by side with the enormous thrill of these moments (of happiness) there comes a strange uprush of spiritual feeling of emotional achievement, as if the mere fact of being the recipient of such an inflowing were something that carried forward the hidden purpose of the universe."²

and happiness is:

"A premonitory rumour of a non-human God-like state of being in which humanity will be merged, lost, surpassed."³

And that is the thesis of this book, that such happiness is God or, as with Alexander we prefer to call it, Deity. There have been many definitions of happiness, entirely pessimistic, like Chateaubriand:

"Happiness is a desert island inhabited merely by the creatures of my imagination."⁴

a completed satisfaction with the self.

"Happiness—that is when a man has successfully discovered his own self and is satisfied with the result."⁵

To some God-given:

"We believe in an Eden, towards which God wills, that humanity traversing the path of error and sacrifice—shall constantly advance."⁶

To others gained by man's endeavour; almost in spite of God:

"The goal is a condition of general happiness. The process must be the necessary outcome of the psychical and social nature of man; it must not be at the mercy of any external will, otherwise there would be no guarantee of its continuance and its issue and the idea of progress would lapse into the idea of providence."⁷

For the poet it cannot be separated from perfected love:

"Love's true passion is of immortal happiness."⁸

¹ J. C. Powis: *In Defence of Sensuality*, p. 63.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

⁴ Chateaubriand: *Letters from My Grave*.

⁵ Maxim Gorki: *Diary*.

⁶ J. Mazzini: *From the Council to God*.

⁷ J. B. Bury: *Selected Essays*.

⁸ R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, III, 300.

and this perhaps comes nearest to the conception presented in this book, for "God is Love" and Love in its widest and fullest sense is Deity.

Man's Conception of Deity

Before, however, we start to consider this difficult question of Deity, we should examine ourselves with all humility. If perfect happiness is Deity, we know from our own experience, that we are very far from perfect happiness, therefore we are very far from Deity. Yet we, in our state of humanity, are raised above the beasts, we are all agreed upon that. We are poised between the lowest forms of life (for the most essential thing about us is that we are alive) and the highest state of Deity and we experience something from each.

The highest and most completely developed parts of ourselves will stretch out to Deity and happiness.

"Now that part or faculty, which seems naturally to rule and take the lead, and to apprehend things noble and divine, whether it be itself divine or only the divinest part of us, is the faculty the exercise of which, in its proper excellence, will be perfect happiness."¹ Our contention is that a state of perfect happiness represents the quality of Deity and Deity is God.

From the dawn of philosophic inquiry, man has sought to apprehend the nature of God, but such attempts have none of them succeeded and the speculations, even of the greatest philosophers, have not met with universal acceptance. In every age rival schools of philosophy have striven for ascendancy, too frequently with the occlusion of truth by the dust of controversy. Nor are we yet capable of a clear definition; we still see through a glass darkly. It is suggested that the result of these difficulties should not be a universal scepticism, such as that of Hume, but an honest agnosticism and an acknowledgement of the fact that we do not know, and at present cannot fully know, things which are admittedly beyond us.

"If God makes Himself known, we shall expect to find progress in man's apprehension of Him and even in that which He discloses. But if He is active in the progress, the progress must bear the marks of His continuing guidance; its earlier stages must be incomplete and one condition of advance is that men become aware of the incompleteness of what they have. So the earlier look forward to the later, groping after it, adumbrating it. Some parts of the adumbration will be mistaken, arising from the human limitations of the prophet or seer, but some parts will be filled in and completed, being gleams of the light that lighteth every man, which, if it ever shines in full brilliance, must be recognizably their completion."²

Man's Need of Belief

An attitude of agnosticism is difficult to most human beings, for, as has already been said, human beings differ from animals in their infinite

¹ Aristotle: *Ethics*.

² W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 324.

capacity for asking why. But asking why implies a passionate demand for an answer, and therefore many of us are not content to admit that we cannot have this answer. We cannot easily:

"Sit down in the quiet ignorance of these things, which upon examination are found to be beyond the reach of our capacities."¹

If we cannot find out the answer by direct observation, we guess; and if the gap we have to bridge between the realm of established fact and the answer to our question is not great, our guesses may be good. Even so, the trouble is that our realm of fact is not so well established as we should like to think, and some new observation may crumble what appears to be a bastion of rock, like a child's sand castle before the incoming tide, and so our guesses are not so reliable as they appear. If, on the other hand, the gap is too wide, our guesses may be far from good and even land us in the most egregious error.

The gulf between our present state and the happiness which is God is a very wide one, and one which we cannot hope to bridge, except by the wildest of guesses. Why then should we guess that our imagined complete happiness will be dull or uneventful? We cannot know and it would be better to acknowledge this and be prepared to leave this question unanswered. We know, or think we know, that the universe of which we have cognisance is finite, but we do not know that this is the only universe and we do not know therefore for certain, whether we have to contemplate a finite degree of progress and improvement coming to an absolute end some day, or whether this progress is infinite and so can never come to an absolute end. As will be seen later, our thought is only really capable of working within a finite space-time *continuum*, and so infinity is only a mathematical abstraction, which has no "real" meaning for us; and indeed it is only with difficulty and in a very tenuous way that we can apprehend it at all.

From the practical point of view these limitations do not concern us a great deal. We have got to live our lives within the limits of space-time and we are beginning to know quite a lot about things within these limits. In fact, we may well be proud of what a lot we do know, but this knowledge is relative, and it behoves us to be humble when we contemplate what a vast amount we do not know, especially in these fields, which are outside space-time.

After all, our progress towards happiness has so far been slight and a vast number of generations must pass before we can have the least chance of approaching the goal, whether in our search for knowledge and truth, in our appreciation of beauty and power of adjustment to life, or in the moulding of our behaviour, in the substance of goodness.

Agnosticism not Atheism

In respect of most of these things, therefore, we must profess agnosticism, but let us be clear as to what we mean by this. There seems to be a

¹ J. Locke: *Essay on Human Understanding*.

confusion of thought in the minds of some people between agnosticism and atheism, both being dismissed as irreligious. Atheism means the disbelief in any sort of God, however God may be defined; a belief, if there is any belief at all, in mere chaos in which we should be the play-things of undirected chance. Many who call themselves atheists, or are so called by the devout, because they do not believe in God as defined by this or that creed, are certainly not atheists. Although they may deny the existence of any personal or personified God, they nevertheless do believe in some sort of order in the Universe, in some sort of quality whereby, or in accordance with which, the universe gets going and continues in its course. Such is the conception advanced in this book and, it is submitted, this is not atheism. Such a belief, however, almost necessarily involves agnosticism, for our conceptions are still very vague and there are many lacunae in our argument left by our lack of knowledge or our human limitations. We must be content to wait for these gaps to be filled in, we must acknowledge that at present we do not know, perhaps cannot know, but we may have faith that with the continued progress of humanity, generations yet unborn may gradually fill in these gaps, until we do reach to a perfect knowledge and attain a capacity for beauty and goodness in our lives. This does not prevent us from speculating as to what this future knowledge may disclose and there is no harm in our doing so, provided we do not expect to be able to dot all the "i's" and cross all the "t's" in our Utopian schemes.

The religious often maintain that such a doctrine is a denial of all faith, but by this they mean to find fault because everyone does not have faith in their own interpretation of the mysteries of the universe. Such people are often unable to think in terms of abstractions and therefore have to eke out their intellectual poverty by trying to cling to a faith that, by some miraculous means, their material and personal conceptions will be proved to be true. Thus being incapable of thinking of a soul without a body, if they are to believe in the immortality of the soul they are forced to believe that the body which has disappeared in recognizable form as the result of corruption, shall somehow or other be gathered together again in some future existence. They can conceive of a truthful statement, but not of an abstract Truth. They can admire a beautiful picture or beautiful music, but for them Beauty has no meaning. They can appreciate a good action, but are quite at a loss if they are called upon to define Goodness.

Carrel was right in his contention:

"Galileo, as is well known, distinguished the primary qualities of things, dimensions and weight, which are easily measurable, from their secondary qualities, form, colour, odour, which cannot be measured. The quantitative was separated from the qualitative. The quantitative, expressed in mathematical language, brought science to humanity. The qualitative was neglected. The abstraction

of the primary qualities of objects was legitimate. But the overlooking of the secondary qualities was not. The mistake had momentous consequences. In man the things which are not measurable are more important than those which are measurable."¹

Belief in the Abstract

People who have, through ignorance or design, neglected the abstractions, must think of their God as a person more or less extended in space and having duration in time. They can attribute qualities to that person, but cannot conceive of the qualities without the person. They therefore demand belief and faith in that person, for unless this is acceded, they cannot understand that any belief or faith can exist. For us, however, we seek to show that there is just as much possibility of belief in the abstract, as there is in the concrete, in the depersonalized God as in the personal God. In other words we have faith in the existence of an abstract God, though we may not be able to define exactly what we mean by this. Samuel Butler expressed the same idea.

"God was but the expression of man's highest conception of goodness, wisdom and power; that in order to generate a more vivid conception of so great and glorious a thought, man had personified it and called it by a name; it was an unworthy conception of the Deity to call Him personal, inasmuch as escape from human contingencies became thus impossible; the real thing man should worship was the Divine, whereinsoever they could find it; God was but man's name of expressing his sense of the Divine; as justice, hope, wisdom, etc., were all parts of goodness so God was the expression which embraced all goodness and all good power; people would no more cease to love God in ceasing to believe in this objective personality, than they had ceased to love justice on discovering that she was not really personal; nay, they would never truly love Him till they saw Him thus.

I have met with many godly people who have had a great knowledge of Divinity, but no sense of the divine; and again I have seen a radiance upon the face of those who were worshipping the divine either in art or nature—in picture or statue—in field or cloud or sea—in man, woman or child, which I have never seen kindled by any talking about the nature and attributes of God."²

Belief confined to a personal God almost necessarily implies that God is directly interested not only in humanity, but in individual human beings and that his personal interventions can not only be invoked, but ought to be expected. This leads us to the chief difficulty and stumbling-block of so many philosophers and theologians, namely the explanation of evil. If God is personally interested in humanity, why are war, pestilence and famine permitted, and why are certain individuals so handicapped in life by illness, deformity or financial misfortune, while

¹ Alexis Carrel: *Man the Unknown*.

² S. Butler: *Erewhon*, Chapter XVI.

the apparently less worthy enjoy all the good things of life? Such difficulties inevitably lead to the conception of personal rewards and punishments in another existence than the present. As has already been said, we have no satisfying proof of personal survival so far, and the upholders of this belief have been forced or attracted into such dangerous speculations as spiritualism, which has led without doubt to much fraud and no little unhappiness and error.

Still true to our honest agnosticism, we must allow that we do not know either about a personal God or individual survival with any certainty, and we must be prepared to admit that the conception of a personal God and of personal survival may be true. Even if it did turn out to be so, it would not in any way upset the general principles here set out, though it would undoubtedly modify, and might indeed simplify, the details of the theory which has been advanced. If, on the other hand, evidence could be brought forward which showed that the personalisation theory was not true, and belief in a personal God and individual survival was no longer possible, then the adherents of this personalization view are left with nothing, while the basic conceptions enunciated above are really untouched. Qualities can certainly be attached to a person and the advance to these qualities exemplified by that person's existence. But the qualities will still be the goal of our endeavour.

Jealous God replaced by God of Love

There is another aspect, however, which, it is submitted, is of considerable importance. From the personalization point of view, progress or success or happiness in this world is the responsibility of God in the long run, although it may be man's responsibility to deserve them. Just rewards for behaviour do not seem to work out in practice, and to explain God's lack of success in running a logical universe it seemed necessary to attribute to Him emotional bias. So we find him referred to as a jealous God, who exhibits a desire for vengeance and even seems capable of taking a sadistic delight in punishment. Although the New Testament presented God as the God of love, complete freedom from the concepts of the Old Testament was not attained.

Such imperfection is not very satisfactory in a Deity who is spoken of as the personification of good by the personalists. Moreover, it puts a very definite limit to human endeavour and responsibility, if human responsibility is a true conception, as these personalists would certainly have us believe. Mankind would then be represented by Mr. Wells's feeble Mr. Britling, who sets out to see the 1914-1918 war through and finding, half way, that things are too much for him, he leaves it all to God. In our conception, as will be seen, the emphasis is all the other way. It is for man to work up to God and not for God to do man's work for him. If man prays, it should be not for personal favours to be granted him by a generally beneficent but capricious Creator, but that he may

be so in tune with Deity that his behaviour and the events which he controls will work out in accordance with the will of God.¹ In our conception the will of God is clear, it is happiness resulting from our efforts, our very best efforts, towards Truth, Beauty and Goodness, and the only obstruction to its achievement is our own blindness to what may be meant by this triad of qualities, and the drag of our imperfections as human beings.

"If happiness be the exercise of virtue, it is reasonable to suppose that it will be the exercise of the highest virtue; and that will be the virtue of excellence of the best part of us."²

Chaos to Harmony

Faith has a very essential and fundamental place in our conception, but the faith is not in a person, but in a process. This process is a progress from chaos to harmony and this will be examined in more detail in the next chapter. What do we mean by this progress from chaos to harmony? So far we have looked forward and have envisaged a path towards Truth, Beauty and Goodness and so to Harmony and Happiness. This implies that the process has started from their opposites, from falsehoods, ugliness and evil, from chaos and unhappiness.

Here it may be we strike a difficulty, for there is no reason to suppose that these evil qualities were, or are, the fate of the lowest forms of life. No one has any right to suppose that the one-celled amoeba is false or particularly ugly or evil, that his life is not passed in an harmonious and well-ordered milieu and, whatever happiness may mean to him, that he is not happy.

But this is to take a too narrow and limited view of the universe. Our postulate is that there is to be an advance towards the widest possible

¹ cf. S. Alexander: *Space, Time and Deity*, II, 400.

"For those who have lived in the midst of disaster (war), however much illumined on either side by the most exalted and conflicting hopes, how is it possible to rest content with a God who does not share these vicissitudes of his creatures, but suffers them to exist? The case is changed if Deity itself is the outcome of the world's movement, and in particular, to the extent of the value of the efforts of human beings. It is not God then who allows the struggle which is to determine, it may not be at once, but in the end, what Deity is to be, which ideal, if either, is to be on the side of the divine. God is not then responsible for the miseries endured in working out his providence, but rather we are responsible for our acts, seeing that on the issue of them depends on their measure the character of God. Nor is it otherwise than natural that men, so engaged, should send up their prayers to a God, whom they suppose to be already in beings and to favour their particular ideals. They embody the forecast of what they hope in a present form. The God they pray to is the God to whose nature they contribute; but the call of their ideal is the call of the universe as a whole as it appeals to them. God may be concerned as being liberated from the course of events, only because his Deity is the tendency of the whole world, towards which the individual goes out in religion as he conceives the outcome of that tendency. A created Deity makes our human position more serious, but frees it from the reproach of subjection to arbitrary providence."

² Aristotle: *Ethics*.

adjustment, with the greatest benefit to the greatest number and not merely to the happiness of one individual. However happy a single amoeba may be, he cannot be supposed to contribute much to the general happiness of organic nature.

Evolutionary Experiments leading to Extinction

We know that the advance which we postulate has not been continuous or without serious setbacks as the results of failures in adjustments. Perhaps the most striking interruption of continued progress was the evolution of the great reptiles, which flourished for a time and then outgrew their food supply and became extinct. But in spite of this and other interruptions, man was eventually evolved and man is the best adapted animal that the world has so far seen. He has spread all over the earth and has used, or is in the process of using, all things living and not living for his own advantage and advancement. It is this power of adjustment to other things, and making other things adjust to him, which makes his claim justifiable to be the highest and most successful form of life.

However, he has not only used things to his advantage and domesticated animals to serve him for food, transport and protection, but he has made war on all these other forms of life and even on non-living things which are harmful to himself or to those other particles of the universe which he has pressed into his service.

Of these the most inimical to man are the lowest forms of life of all, which certainly have not evolved towards the general benefit of all. These are the microbes of disease, against which man wages a continuous war. War is also waged against the beasts of prey, against the poisonous plants and even against the natural phenomena of tempest and drought, while the most terrible potential enemy of all—fire—man has tamed to his own use. That is what progress is and it is this progress of which man alone is fully capable. It is he that is the chief help in the progressive march from chaos to harmony; the chaos of each for the particular and none for the general, to the harmony of all for the general, which will, in fact, mean all for the particular.

Natural Selection and Human Selection

It should be noted that natural selection has little to do with this progress and, except for the fact that by its means man himself has been evolved, has little influence upon it. By means of natural selection the malaria parasite has established its complicated life history and found its environment so suitable that it has multiplied exceedingly. In the same way the poisonous snake, the man-eating tiger and the venomous herb have established themselves. It is otherwise with human selection, for by this the evil is eliminated and the good encouraged, very slowly, very uncertainly and often with the greatest errors, but still, by and large, man is moulding the universe to his will and it is our article of faith

that man's will is, on the whole and in the widest view, beneficent and tending towards Deity.

We may agree that man has not got very far in this direction, but in countless generations there is no doubt that human selection will replace natural selection altogether. He has not so far concerned himself with the indifferent plants and animals, and the amoeba of our ponds is left in peace to engulf his diatoms with complete indifference to and from the human race. It is otherwise, however, with his cousin the amoeba histolitica, the parasite causing one form of dysentery. Man is not indifferent to him, and does his best to kill him on every possible occasion by the administration of emetine, which is a deadly poison to him. It may be, in the far distant future when man has still further multiplied and plenished the earth, that some consideration, such as food supply, will force him to turn his attention to the indifferent forms of life and he will have to say, "he that is not with me is against me" and that any plant or animal which cannot be turned to man's use will have to be eliminated for the general good.

Man's Contribution to Progress

If this conception is allowed, it is another argument against that of a personal God, for it is difficult to understand, as many have remarked before, why God made microbes; but if natural selection is only a means of a very minor advance from primal chaos and is to be replaced by human selection, itself a product of the highest advance so far achieved, then man as the vanguard of progress is making a very significant contribution to the march of happiness. It is, of course, definitely not implied that human selection as at present practised is either always wise or even often successful, but then we have not got very far along the road to wisdom. Nevertheless the present breed of *homo sapiens* is an advance on the *homo sapiens* of the Pleistocene era. Though in a time of world wars the advance may not be very apparent, it is to be hoped and expected that the *homo sapiens* of many generations hence will be wiser and have many more powers, which, if used in the right way, may eliminate the enemies of mankind.

"Science, which has transformed the material world, gives man the power of transforming himself. . . . For the first time in history, humanity, helped by science, has become master of its destiny."¹

Prolongation of Life not necessarily desirable

Already we have gone some way towards improving the conditions of the world for ourselves and our objects must be to eliminate disease and avoid accidents. Whether this would prolong life is another matter. In the Utopian dreams of many people, the prolongation of individual life has seemed almost an essential, but such a result might well be a

¹ Alexis Carrel: *Man the Unknown*.

disadvantage to the race as a whole, whatever it might be to the individual. What is wanted is an improvement in the general social heritage rather than in the individual's personal advantage. Each individual must contribute to the general good and to do this in the best way he must have a body and mind free from disease. All medical science must be directed to providing him with these, effort being gradually transferred from curative medicine to preventive medicine, until infection, new growth and premature degeneration shall be eliminated and protection against accident so improved that the latter is reduced almost to vanishing point. On the other hand, whether it is going to be of advantage to the community as a whole, that individual life should be prolonged much, if at all, beyond the present span, is altogether another matter, for general rather than particular experience may be required. The answer to this question may well be left to the future, for human selective breeding will be quite capable of producing the optimum span of life when we reach the stage of wisdom, when this can be determined. Even so:

"Men now may modify their environment, change their culture, with a deliberate purpose. The man that is to be, comes at the call of the man that is. Conscious evolution becomes the principle of our action."¹

Importance of Social Heritage

This brings us to reconsider the respective importance of germ plasm and social heritage referred to in Chapter I. It looks as if the second is of much greater importance than the first. The germ plasm cannot be altered by the agency of the individual and can only be changed by selection acting on the variations, resulting from the mixing and redistribution of the chromosomes, which carry the hereditary factors. It is obviously necessary, if the human mind and body are to progress and allow for the full happiness which we have envisaged, that selection should operate. But we cannot afford to leave this to slow, undirected changes in the germ plasm. We must do all we can to improve social heritage and perhaps bring this to bear on the germ plasm itself. We cannot be sure, however, at the present time, whether this is operating to the best advantage or in the best possible way. Although it may be true that:

"During the last three hundred years—in fact during the last sixty or seventy years—the soul of man has developed strangely in its sentiments and in its powers of feeling, in its powers, in fact, of enjoying life."²

we may still have to learn how to hasten, intensify and consolidate our gains.

¹ Lord Samuel: *Belief and Action*.

² W. H. Mallock: *The New Republic*, p. 224.

No longer "Survival of the Fittest"

In the animal world, where the struggle for existence is continually at fever heat, the weaker go to the wall and the best adapted survive. In the case of mankind, however, this is not so. His control over his environment minimises the struggle and the result seems to many people little short of disastrous. A very desirable increase in altruism and consideration for our fellows has led to a protection of the weak. This has proceeded to such lengths, that natural selection has almost ceased to operate upon mankind, but so far we have done very little to put anything in its place.

It is right that man should have regard for his weaker and less fortunate brethren, but there seems no reason why he should almost deliberately increase their number, by doing nothing about improving the germ plasm. He is already engaged in improving his stock of domestic animals and plants for his own advantage and he ought to apply his knowledge of selective breeding to himself so as to produce the best possible offspring and we must of course decide what we want to aim at. An indication of this is given on p. 122. This selection will have to be done by some form of scientific birth-control, whether by sterilization or by some universally safe and simple means which has yet to be discovered, so that bad stock shall not be perpetuated, but done it must be. That the idea is in the air is a sign of grace, though it has often enough been prevalent before, without having much effect; but now that our knowledge of medical art and chemical science has so far advanced that we have the means to our hands, we must press on to some practical conclusion.

Eugenic Measures

Perhaps it may be that our wisdom may be sufficient to put efficient eugenic measures into practice, but this wisdom depends less on the germ plasm, than on social heritage, and they must be got to work together. With the increase of intelligence in man, this social heritage will be more important both in order to modify the germ plasm and to increase its own excellence. Social heritage represents the accumulated wisdom of the race, which can be put into operation immediately and so hasten the advent of the alterations which take such long ages to accomplish by modification of the germ plasm. But so far the tendency has been to think rather along lines of selfishness and greed, in terms of individual life. This tendency is exemplified by the idea of unlimited extension of the span of life. This possibility is generally thought of, not in terms of "Can such a long-lived person contribute more to the common weal?" but "Can I get advantage or interest by living longer?" "Can I accumulate more wealth?" or even "Can I gratify my curiosity as to what will be the outcome of certain events, the start of which I have watched?"

Social heritage will have an accelerating influence on progress which will become greater and greater as time goes on and wisdom increases.

In time, it may entirely replace natural selection by selective breeding, not only of animals and plants but also of man himself. There is no reason why a breed of *homo sapiens* should not be developed, who is really capable of appreciating and practising Truth, Beauty and Goodness and so of obtaining real happiness. He will have a body endowed with all advantages a man can have in health and capacity to learn, to feel and to do; the social heritage he receives will be so rich, that all wisdom will be available to his apprehension, all beauty will be presented to him for his appreciation and he will intuitively react to life in such a way that there will be no mistakes, no conflicts, no fears and no uncertainties. He will be able to say with absolute certainty at the end of his life, "I have made no man weep."

Maximum Good of Race is Ultimate Aim

Whether he will live longer or die earlier is another matter about which we can profess agnosticism, but it will not worry our ultimate man for his whole energy and endeavour will be put to benefiting the race and not himself.

"The best type of affection is reciprocally life-giving, each receives affection with joy and gives it without effort, and each finds the whole world more interesting in consequence of this reciprocal happiness."¹ So the length of his life does not matter even to himself, for at that stage of existence in benefiting the race he will indeed benefit himself and he will not only taste real happiness, but enjoy it throughout his life. As we have said, we cannot envisage exactly what that happiness will be like or exactly how the man of the future will live his life, but that life will be very full and rich and that experience will be vivid, there can be no doubt at all.

It might be argued that this is all very well for man, but the whole of this envisaged progress is essentially for his own advantage and he is going to exploit the whole of the rest of creation for his own uses. Surely this is selfish and not making for the universal happiness of all God's creatures. But our thesis is progress from the quality of chaos to the quality of Deity. What we must ask ourselves is, does humanity show more of the quality of Deity than do the lower animals? If the answer is yes, and we submit that it must be, then, if we are to advance to Deity, all lower forms of life must serve humanity. Man must make use of all means to promote his great end, unless and until something higher and better than humanity is evolved. If such a super-race does emerge, then man in his present form must serve that super-race in his turn and even, if necessary, he must be exterminated.

¹ B. Russell: *The Conquest of Happiness*, p. 182.

THE PROOF OF PROGRESS

Is there Progress?

Throughout the argument so far we have talked of the progress from Humanity to Deity. Before going any further we must consider whether we have any right to postulate that any progress is taking place at all. Writing in the period of the greatest and most destructive war in all history, we may well ask ourselves if there really is any progress in human affairs. Yet practically the whole human race believes in such progress and Buckle remarks that:

"The marked tendency of advancing civilisation is to strengthen our belief in the universality of order, and of method and of law."¹
for, as Havelock Ellis says:—

"We have seen a Star in the East. We shall never know how many thousands of years ago it was when that saying first arose amongst men as a conscious belief in human progress. We only know that it is still uttered in tones as fresh and youthful as ever."²

Recently, on the other hand, certain physicists have been inclined to scoff at any doctrine of progress because they say that, in the long run, it must be futile. According to their calculations, the principles of entropy are established with almost complete certitude and the universe, as we know it, is running down. However, we don't know all about the universe yet and we need not take even physicists too seriously. Starting from

" . . . a dark
Illimitable ocean without bound,
Without dimension, where length, breadth and height
And time and place are lost, where eldest night
And chaos, ancestors of nature, hold
Eternal anarchy."³

A chaos of incandescent whirling nebulae, through a process of gradual cooling, extending over billions of years, has gradually assumed its orderly structure of inter-related moving bodies. It so happens that our earth, perhaps alone among all the arrangements of so-called matter, is enjoying just those conditions of temperature and motility which allow of the maintenance of life, but as our solar system cools and slows down, as to all appearances many of the stellar systems far out in space have done, then this viviparous phase must pass and life become extinct on

¹ H. T. Buckle: *Civilisation in England*, p. 5.

² Havelock Ellis: *The Star in the East* (Essays).

³ John Milton: *Paradise Lost*, II.

our planet. Admittedly, according to our present knowledge, this may happen, in fact, it is very likely to happen, nevertheless, we must admit we do not know for certain that it will or whether some new change will intervene, possibly devised by human ingenuity, during the next ten million years. Some hold that life may be extinguished on the earth's surface by a rise in the sun's temperature before the eventual cooling takes place, and it is not impossible that a method of temperature control might be devised which would cancel out these opposing calamities. Even so, as we shall attempt to show in the course of our argument, what may happen within the space-time *continuum* of science is not the whole material presented for our consideration and perhaps not by any means the most important material, since we are concerned not with the "matter" of the physical universe, but with the spiritual aspect of humanity, a very much wider realm of discourse.

The Meaning of Progress

Assuming then for the moment that we have the right to talk of progress in relation to humanity, what do we mean by progress? It is a word that is continually on our lips, but we use it in so many different senses that it is hard to know of what progress really consists. Progress in the accumulation of wealth only seems to lead to the glorification of the few and the grinding down of the many. Progress in scientific achievement only seems to lead to devastating and destructive wars, so what is to be our standard? It is suggested that the real fundamental criterion of progress is better adaptation to life, so that happiness in the sense *already discussed* will be brought to the greatest number and eventually to all mankind.

Let us examine in greater detail, how and on what basis this progress has taken place. We have already seen that the only valid claim of man to superiority over the animal kingdom is that the possession of a larger and more complexly developed brain allows him to adapt himself more perfectly to the very varied conditions of life which exist on our planet. This, together with his emancipated hands, has enabled him to make tools and these, as we shall see, are making and will continue to make possible a limitless adaptation.

The Influence of the Herd Instinct

In addition to this individual superiority, there is another factor, however, which is of the very greatest importance in progress and that is man's gregariousness which is associated with the tendency to the universal ethic of reciprocity, to which reference has already been made. The stimulus given to biological inquiry by the Darwinian observations, which led to the theory of natural selection as the driving force of evolution, has tended to concentrate attention too much on the aspect of individual conflict and struggle and has diverted attention from the very great influence of co-operative action.

"Humanity cannot herself act otherwise than by her separable members; but the efficiency of these members depends upon their working in co-operation, whether instinctively or by design."¹

As Kropotkin² pointed out, it is the gregarious animals who have multiplied and peopled the earth, while the solitary animals have had to develop powerful weapons of offence and defence, in order to survive at all, even at a high level of evolution. If animals are solitary, like the gorilla and the orang-outang, to mention the two highest solitary animals, they only survive in isolated areas where environmental conditions are peculiarly favourable, as remnants of a race which is probably rapidly disappearing from the earth.

Present-day history would seem to indicate that nations which pursue a solitary course are doomed in the long run, it may be a very long run, to suffer disaster. If they are weak they will be swallowed up by their stronger neighbours, and if they are strong and use their strength only for their selfish ends, then eventually others will combine against them and they will suffer defeat.

Mutual Aid

Mutual aid is the accompaniment and possibly the product of gregariousness and this may be found even at the purely instinctive level, for we cannot agree with some of the older naturalists, who would have it that insects are capable of intelligent foresight. We must attribute their behaviour to instinct, yet much of it does look as if it had been intelligently planned. We read that burying-beetles, which require to lay their eggs in slowly putrifying flesh, unite together to bury the bodies of dead birds and mice, so that several may lay their eggs in flesh which will not decay too fast. This apparent provision allows the larvæ, when they hatch out, to feed and grow on the carrion in which they live. Or again, we hear of several Molucca crabs in an aquarium gathering round a companion who had fallen on his back and who was prevented from righting himself by the intervention of an iron bar. The other crabs strove for hours to set him back on his feet and eventually succeeded.

In view of these and other examples quoted by Kropotkin we can no longer believe in the Hobbesian doctrine that the normal occupation of all animals, including man, was to indulge in internecine strife, with every individual tearing at another's throat. On the contrary, it would seem that, except in the case of the carnivorous animals, which are notoriously hostile to the rest, mutual aid is a fundamental impulse, which can only be overcome with difficulty and by dint of long training. This is especially true of man. As Kropotkin says:

"There is the gist of human psychology, unless men are maddened on the battlefield, they . . . cannot bear . . . to hear appeals for help and not respond to them."³

¹ A. Comte: *A General View of Positivism*, p. 370.

² Kropotkin: *Mutual Aid*.

³ Prince Petr Kropotkin: *Mutual Aid*.

Too much and too often in history has this natural human kindness, insisted upon long ago by Aristotle, been overlaid by the influence of human greed, self-seeking and cruelty, but:

"The natural and social calamities pass away. Whole populations are periodically reduced to misery or starvation; the very springs of life are crushed out of millions of men, reduced to city pauperism; the understanding and feelings of the millions are vitiated by teachings worked out in the interests of the few. All this is certainly part of our existence. But the nucleus of mutual support, habits and customs, institutions, remain alive in the millions, it keeps them together, and they prefer to cling to their customs, beliefs and traditions, rather than to accept the teachings of a war of each against all, which are offered to them under the title of science, but which are no science at all."¹

Finally, Kropotkin sums up his survey of this principle of mutual aid as follows:

"In the animal world we have seen that the vast majority of animals live in societies and that they find in association the best arms for the struggle for life. . . . The animal species in which the individual struggle has been reduced to its narrowest limits and the practice of mutual aid has attained the greatest development, are invariably the most numerous, the most prosperous and the most open to further progress. The mutual protection which is obtained in this case, the possibility of attaining old age and accumulating experience, the highest intellectual development and the further growth of sociable habits, secure the maintenance of the species, its extension and its further progressive evolution. The unsociable species on the contrary are doomed to decay. Going next over to man, we found him living in clans and tribes at the very dawn of the stone age; we saw a wide series of social institutions developed already in the lower savage stage in the clan and the tribe; and we found that the earliest tribal customs and habits gave to mankind the embryo of all the institutions which made later on the leading aspects of further progress. Out of the savage tribe grew up the barbarian village community and a new, still wider circle of social customs, habits and institutions, numbers of which are still alive amongst ourselves, was developed under the principle of common possession of a given territory and common defence of it, under the jurisdiction of the village folk-mote, and in the federation of villages belonging, or supposed to belong, to one stem. And where requirements induced men to make a new start, they made it in the city, which represented a double network of territorial units (village communities connected with guilds, these latter arising out of the common prosecution of a given art or craft, or for mutual support or defence). And finally, although the growth of the state on the pattern of Imperial Rome had put a violent end to all mediæval institutions for mutual support, this new aspect of civilisation could not last. The state based on the aggregation of individuals and

¹ *Ibid.*

undertaking to be their only bond of union did not answer its purpose. The mutual aid tendency finally broke down its iron rules; it re-appeared and reasserted itself in an infinity of associations, which now tend to embrace all aspects of life and to take possession of all that is required by man for life."¹

In fact:

"Men, like children whose mother has departed from their home, were slowly being forced to trust in, and be good to, themselves and one another, and so to form out of their necessity, desperately, unconsciously, their new great belief in humanity."²

Self-assertion

It will probably be remarked that mutual aid, even though it may represent one of the factors of evolution, covers, nevertheless, only one aspect of human relations. By the side of this current, powerful though it may be, there is and always has been the other current, the self-assertion of the individual and therefore Kropotkin may have overstated his case, for certain solitary animals and birds, such as the cuckoo and the cornrake, do survive. This instinct drives him forward with much inherent zest, not only to obtain personal or caste superiority, economical, political and spiritual, but also to break down the bonds which the tribe, the village community, the city and the state impose upon the individual throughout his life. In other words, the self-assertion of the individual may act as a progressive force, which may interact with, or come into conflict with, the gregarious tendencies of the community. At any rate to begin with, both these forces are necessary to ensure progress, but with increasing knowledge, wisdom and goodness the function of mutual aid should gain the ascendancy and harness the zest of self-assertion to its own ends, no longer requiring the stimulus of selfish individual assertion to lift it out of the rut of conservatism and to overcome its natural diffidence and even cowardice. Assertion will always be necessary, but it should be collective and directed towards the universal and not national, much less the purely personal, good. Once again, patriotism is not enough. Individual or sectional assertion, or greed, to put it more bluntly, is the basis of war.

The mid-nineteenth century philosophers, who, following the Hobbesian pessimism, declared that war was the natural state of man, were wrong, though their attitude was not unnatural, dependent as they were on man's historical records, which are indeed little else than a narrative of war, aggression and rapine. Ethnological and archæological records show, however, that primitive man, at least up to the beginning of the age of iron, knew nothing of war.

¹ Prince Petr Kropotkin: *Mutual Aid*.

² John Galsworthy: *A Portrait*.

Man and War

Man was too puny, too scattered, too concerned with his constant war with nature, in scraping a livelihood from the earth, and defending himself against the larger carnivores, to have the time or energy to fight against his fellows. Nor did he need to, for he had plenty of room to expand and the problem of *lebensraum* had not even appeared on the horizon. As Havelock Ellis says:—

“War owed its expansion to two great forces—the attractive force of booty and commercial gain in front, and the propulsive force of a confined population, with a high birth-rate, behind.”¹

Can we ever get rid of these two forces and therefore get rid of war? This depends on the advance towards reciprocity, which we hope and believe is really in the ascendancy. This should remove the first by allowing everyone to share in the necessities and essential raw materials of the earth, and as to the second, there are still plenty of empty spaces on the earth which man, with his increasing powers of adaptability, can make use of and nature herself seems gradually to be reducing the human birth-rate.

This reduction may be thought to be unequal and to the detriment of the best races of mankind, yet we cannot judge of this in one generation and it may not necessarily prove to work out this way in the long run.

It may be that the issue will be very different from what we hope, but the actual statement of the Atlantic Charter was so very different from what used to be recognized as the aims of war, that it gives ground for hope that the principle of reciprocity and unselfishness is in our minds, though not yet fully reflected in our deeds. If we really do mean that our war aims are, “To seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other”; “To further enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world, which are needed for their economic prosperity”; “To bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all, improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security”; “To secure that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want”; “That all nations of the world must come to the abandonment of the use of force,” then, indeed, an advance will have been made. If we can believe that:

“Our definition of life asserts the imperfection of the finite creature and its gradual self-correction, by virtue of a capacity of progression, given to all men through works; through the sacrifice of the egotistic instincts for the sake of the common improvement and through faith in a divine ideal, which each is bound to incarnate in himself.”²
we shall not be deceived in our hopes.

However, in considering human progress, we must remember not to think in terms of human generations because, if in our own lifetime

¹ Havelock Ellis: *Essays*.

² J. Mazzini: *From the Council to God*.

the world seems to be closer to the dogs at the end than at the beginning, even if this is not a mere reflection of our own personal disappointment, it is no reason for despair. However we look at the history of human life, we see that there is no smooth curve of progress, there are marked periods of regression. Yet the next upward spring, like the incoming tide, begins from a higher platform than the one before, which has been advanced by the previous uprushes of human genius.

The Progress of Mankind

The first spectacular uprising of the mental achievement of the human race as applied to knowledge and culture was in the fifth and sixth centuries B.C., when such great men as Isaiah in Babylon, Thales, Solon and Anaximander in Miletus, Heraclitus in Ephesus, Buddha, Confucius and Lao-Tse in China, were all alive at the same time. Previously striking advances had been made, as when man had tamed fire and brought it into his own service and when he discovered the malleability of metals, but these were not specifically recorded in history. Although this blossoming of intellect throughout the world died down again, it laid the foundations for the golden age of Greek literature and art, which flourished for a century and a half from the age of Pericles (466-428 B.C.) onwards. This learning, just kept alive during the period of the material greatness of Rome, seemed then to sink down into complete oblivion for a thousand years. It rose again, however, to greater glory in the fifteenth century. The splendour of the Renaissance could never have been achieved had not the classical tradition been there to draw upon. No doubt people in the dark ages, and there were some to whom literary taste was as the breath of life, felt that the whole world was sinking back into barbarism, as indeed for the time being it was. Now that we can look at these times in better perspective we know that culture was not lost; it was but in hiding, ready when the chance came to fortify the new advance.

Intellectual Progress

The history of philosophy illustrates these periodic spasms of intellectual achievement. The most noteworthy of the early advancements of knowledge resulting from careful observation and brilliant speculation was the era of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. This intellectual flowering later faded into the futile worship of the word by the Schoolmen, who seemed to forget the spirit. Then came the single voice of Roger Bacon crying in the wilderness in the thirteenth century, "Look at the world! Experiment! Experiment!" We must not forget the influence of the insidious scepticism of the Emperor Frederick the Second and his court philosopher Michael Scott in the same century. Next came the age of the great philosophers, from Francis Bacon and Hobbes to Descartes and the succession of thinkers, who in turn upheld all views then possible of the nature of knowledge and the way the universe worked. This philosophic

achievement culminated in Kant, who tried to correlate and to some extent reconcile their various views. Then with the great strides made by science, men's interests were focused for a time to the more practical applications of knowledge rather than to the elucidation of general laws.

Æsthetic Progress

Similarly there have been spasmodic advances in the creation and appreciation of Beauty. The classic art of Athens under Pericles, the builders of the Gothic cathedrals, the painters and the sculptors of the Renaissance, especially in Italy, and the great musicians, Bach, Beethoven, Mozart and Brahms in Germany, not to mention the great poets, Dante, Shakespeare and Goethe, are examples of these peaks of progress.

Ethical Progress

It is more difficult to define with any exactitude the high spots in the advance of Goodness, for history has so concentrated on the evils of mankind, the wars, the usurpations, the political and religious strifes of men, that there seems to have been little space in the history books for any record of good. Yet all the great religions of history, whatever they may have become under the misdirection of us men, have at least started in an attempt to create a new world out of the chaos and darkness of the old. Confucius, Buddha, Jesus of Nazareth and Mahomet had very different ideas of how the reform was to take place and indeed of what the reform was to consist, but all strove for a greater degree of reciprocity and a higher and purer standard of human behaviour. What they aimed at, in fact, was the old and well-nigh universal criterion of Goodness, Love thy Neighbour and Love thy God. In spite of what historians like Buckle may say, it has not been the religions themselves which have made for war, but the stupidity, the selfishness and greed of man in his interpretations of these religions which have led to the many wars waged in the name of religion.

Even in our own much abused age, while we must admit that the great accumulation of scientific knowledge and its practical application has led to much cruelty, much ugliness and perhaps ultimately to the two greatest wars in history, never has the social conscience worked so fast or indeed so successfully to establish social services to counteract the evils which the age produced and to spend at least some of the accumulated wealth for the benefit of the common weal.

This we shall have to examine in more detail presently to illustrate that we are still progressing, but let us see how man has progressed in his long history, in spite of his many setbacks, his dark ages, his mistakes and his follies.

Fire in the Service of Man

Man's first step in real progress was when he first discovered how to make use of fire. This apparently came before he discovered how to make

fire when he wanted it, for we find some primitive communities still alive on earth who carefully guard the flames of their fires, presumably started by some natural means such as lightning. They tend them in their huts and temples lest they go out and the precious element be lost to them. The fire which must never be extinguished, which we meet with in so many religious observances, is a relic of this fear. The answer to the question, when did man first discover how to use fire to warm and light himself in the dark caves which he inhabited and to scare away the wild animals which threatened his existence, is lost in the mists of antiquity. But it seems tolerably certain that man knew how to produce fire by striking a spark from a flint, 50,000 or 60,000 years ago, at the end of the last great ice age. This was the first great scientific discovery, which changed the world for man perhaps more than anything else has ever done.

Tools

About the same time as the discovery of fire, the emancipation of man's hands led, not only to his use of them for all sorts of purposes which were beyond the capacity of four-footed animals, but also led to his invention of tools, which extended the use of his hands. The chipped flints of the palæolithic age carry us back to the Neanderthal creature, who, if not in the direct ancestral line from which man has sprung, was approaching him in structure and function. With these tools he fought his animal enemies and killed those which he required for food. He dressed their skins for covering and employed other simple arts, but, so far as we can tell, he did not yet till the ground. He was able to hollow out trees to act as boats to carry him across the water and enable him to kill fish to supplement his food supply.

Focused Sight

In order to make tools, however, he not only required his emancipated hands, but he had to perfect the use of his binocular vision, which had become possible when his eyes moved to the front of his head and his brain became more complicated so that he could see things in three dimensions and appreciate the shape of the things which he was handling.

Speech

The same sort of complexity of brain was necessary to allow of the perfection of what we now know as speech. Animals can make noises which differ sufficiently to convey to others of their kind certain simple emotional reactions, but it is only man who can vary these noises sufficiently to transmit useful knowledge from one to the other. What this meant in progress, coming as it did with the discovery of the means of using fire and the manufacture of tools, must stagger our imaginations, if we really give our minds to the consideration of what it would mean to do without these commodities, which now seem to be such essential

parts of our everyday existence, or to be unable to tell each other the hows and wheres and whens and whys of everything with which we meet.

The Use of Metals

This was the beginning of social heritage, but at first this must have been very limited indeed. The power of pictorial representation came very early, for the walls of caves show drawings, which were often of very considerable merit, of the hairy mammoth, which became extinct tens of thousands of years ago, but these early drawings were of little service to mankind, for flat surfaces of rocks or the walls of caves could not be handed round to others of the race. Still it did mean that man could transmit to man quite complex ideas and that the record of these ideas could be handed down to future generations.

Progress developed very rapidly in the early days with the increasing perfection of tools, made by grinding and shaping stones. The first began in Egypt seven thousand years ago and replaced the process of roughly chipping them. Then the discovery of the art of moulding copper advanced man's capacity still further. With this, metal tools could be made for agriculture as well as for defence and offence. Moreover, such tools could be manufactured on a wide scale and when, probably accidentally, it was discovered that when copper and tin were melted together they formed a tougher and harder alloy which we call bronze, a further advance was made in the construction of all sorts of tools, enough, in fact, to supply all that man needed at that stage of his existence.

It was not, however, until the use of iron was discovered in about 1400 B.C. that real progress in tool making was made and from that time progress in this direction has never looked back, during the 3,300 years which have elapsed. As a result we now have the locomotive, the aeroplane and alas! the machine-gun and the bomb.

Written Records

For many centuries the transmission of knowledge depended on the spoken word, but written records, largely in pictorial representation, date back to about 3,000 B.C. in the great Sumerian empire of Mesopotamia. These records were inscribed on clay tablets baked in the sun, the characters being impressed by a wedge-shaped stylet (cuneiform writing) and soon symbols were invented to represent the pictures and numerals were used to express numbers, until the alphabet crystallized out in Egypt about 2,500 B.C. Here also papyrus was used instead of clay to write upon, which was certainly an improvement from the point of view of transmissibility. Even so the clumsy rolls of parchment and papyrus restricted both the writers and the readers and it was not until paper came into general use that extensive transmission of knowledge was possible.

Paper came from China, where it was probably in use as early as 200 B.C., but it was introduced into Europe by the Saracens and it was not until the fourteenth century that its employment became general. Once paper became available, printing, which was simply an application of the primitive seal, known to the Sumerians and the early Egyptians, was a logical invention, and so the modern book had its birth, with all its powers for good and evil.

Through all these stages man has increased his power of adaptation and at least his potentialities of reciprocity and mutual aid, but another invention which came from China, that of gunpowder, first used on a large scale in war by the Mongol conquerors under Genghis and Ogdais Khan in the thirteenth century, was a less promising omen and may have done as much to retard man's progress as paper did to promote it.

Political Progress

The first progress then was in knowledge and practical achievement. Later we find the beginnings of the appreciation and creation of beauty, which culminated in the great ages of Greek and Renaissance art. These ages were more remarkable for advances in the creation of human art than in the achievement of that inward beauty which makes for adaptation.

"The first fruits of the recovered manhood of the race were material achievements and material power. The science of human relationship, of individual and social psychology, of education and economics, are not only more subtle and intricate in themselves, but also bound up inextricably with much emotional matter. The advances made in them have been slower and made against great opposition. Man will listen dispassionately to the most diverse suggestions about stars and nebulae, but the ideas about our ways of life touch upon everyone about us."¹

Still, just as Plato's Republic was one of the first attempts to turn men's minds to a better way of life, so the great religions continued this work with greater or less success. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Sir Thomas More's Utopia set men's minds towards some political ideal largely based on the conditions pertaining at the time. By the end of the seventeenth century there was a considerable mass of literature dealing with political and social science. Bacon and Locke in England, Montesquieu and the encyclopædists in France set the fashion for recording men's visions of a new heaven and a new earth and laid the foundations of modern socialism.

Still these were only ideas and they produced very little immediate results, for the French Revolution was the logical outcome of the theories advanced, and however ultimately productive its ideas were to prove, it did little to improve the lot of the average man at the time. This was because the impulse, apart from the mere idea of altruism, had not yet

¹ H. G. Wells: *A Short History of the World*.

penetrated sufficiently into the personality of man to influence his behaviour.

With the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century came the age of material and scientific discovery, which turned men's minds back again to individual advantage and narrowly national profits and postponed for nearly a hundred years the results which ought to have followed the great upheaval of the French Revolution. As it was, the only immediate effect was the rise of Napoleon and a new tyranny.

In the last century, then, progress has been most marked in material rather than in artistic things. The discovery of the blast furnace, whereby iron and steel could be cast instead of wrought, so that the metals could be moulded in large masses, opened the way for still greater productive advance. At the same time the experimental chemist increased the potentialities of metallurgy and the discovery of more useful alloys from new combinations of metals became possible. This allowed almost unlimited variations in plasticity, toughness and durability of materials.

Recent Discoveries

If the harnessing of fire was the first great advance in the social economy of man, the harnessing of electricity was followed by even more cataclysmic results. The steamboat and the railway were already revolutionising transport and communications, but the telegraph and telephone still further reduced distances, so that colonists, who were previously cut off from the mother country and home government by weeks and months and even years of uncertain communication, were brought within daily or even hourly relationship both with authority and friends. Then came the internal combustion engine and wireless communication, which will certainly represent progress in the long run, but whether they be beneficent or maleficent in the meantime many will be uncertain.

Before we pass a final judgment on this, however, it behoves us to remember that we are still at the beginning, we are still like children playing with a new toy, which is just a little "old" for us, and if we break it and we break ourselves into the bargain, it is little wonder. But, as in childhood the "too old" toy soon becomes an object of daily and efficient use, wherefrom we learn to pass on to the next materials for our education; so if we take the long view, we may find that we shall learn to use these weapons, which now in our clumsy hands seem so destructive, to the better advantage of all mankind.

The political and social theories, which perhaps precipitated the French Revolution prematurely, and which seem to have been forgotten in the industrial revolution which followed, with its new facility in machine making, were not all lost. Even though these revolutions seemed to draw out all that was greedy, all that was selfish and all that was ugly in human nature and although this is not often mentioned in the histories, there is no doubt that its very evil stimulated the social consciousness of the race and under the leadership of people like Lord Shaftesbury,

Elizabeth Fry and a host of others, a very great deal has been done since the beginning of this too-often disconsidered age to increase the spirit of reciprocity and mutual aid. It is worth while to examine this and even though vast mistakes have been made, mistakes so bad as to result in two world wars, yet we may still have faith that, since we have ideas of progress and a deep-seated fundamental urge towards mutual aid, we shall produce at the right time and in the proper season that toughness of moral fibre with which we shall use these means to bring to a pass a really successful end. Again, to quote Mr. Wells:

“Man is still only adolescent. His troubles are not the troubles of senility and exhaustion, but of increasing and still undisciplined strength. When we look at all history as one process . . . when we see the steadfast upward struggle of life towards vision and control, then we see in their true proportions the hopes and dangers of the present time. As yet, we are hardly in the earliest dawn of human greatness. But in the beauty of flower and sunset, in the happy and perfect movement of young animals and in the delight of ten thousand various landscapes, we have some intimations of what life can do for us; and in some few works of plastic and pictorial art, in some great music, in a few noble buildings and happy gardens, we have an intimation of what the human will can do with material possibilities. We have dreams; we have at present undisciplined but ever-increasing power. Can we doubt that presently our race will more than realise our boldest imaginations, that it will achieve unity and peace, that it will live, that the children of our blood and loves will live, in a world made more splendid and lovely than any palace or garden that we know, going on from strength to strength in an ever-widening circle of adventure and achievement? What man has done, the little triumphs of his present state and all his history, form but the preludes to the things that man has yet to do.”¹

¹ H. G. Wells: *A Short History of the World*, p. 327.

SERVICE BY THE STATE

Autocracy and Democracy

In his conception of mutual aid, Kropotkin tended to regard the state as universally oppressive and thought that it was only in the small community that each man helped his fellows. With his vision fixed on the far from benevolent Czarist Russia, this was no doubt a reasonable attitude, but even in an autocratic state there is no reason inherent in its nature why should there not be a benevolent consideration for mankind as a whole.

"God is the helping of man by man and that is the way to eternal glory."¹

Nevertheless, it must be confessed that throughout history, directly man has risen to individual power, then greed, selfishness and pride seem sooner or later to rear their heads and dominate his conduct.

The democratic form of government is, therefore, more likely to foster the truly benevolent care of the individual, which will help him through life and put the means of happiness in his way. It can never, of course, compel him to work for his own happiness and probably any attempt at coercion will defeat its own object. It seems that mankind as a whole allows the State to say thou shalt not do this and that, but immediately resents any attempt of the State to say thou shalt. Still the State can compel its citizens to carry out positive orders by prohibiting the opposite.

Punishment

Communities generally accept without question the penal codes, by which such crimes as murder, rape and theft are punished, because it is felt that the individual must not be allowed to interfere with the persons and property of others to the detriment of the latter. This coercive prohibition is extended not only to actual harm done to the individual, but also to potential harm done to the community. This is illustrated by the laws which prohibit those who are suffering from communicable disease from mixing freely with the rest of the populace. Similarly, the State insists that those whose mental state is such that they may be dangerous or an intolerable nuisance to others shall be confined and controlled, if necessary by force.

Individual Liberty

On the other hand, man has not so far accepted, except under the compulsion of an autocratic tyranny, the right of the State to dictate

¹ Pliny: *Natural History*, XI, vii, 13.

to him whether he shall conduct his own life wisely or foolishly. Such free choice of wisdom or folly is what we call the liberty of the individual. We may reflect that:

"A static universe might be free from evils; a race always under guidance might be free from evils, but not a world that changes and men that choose. In choosing we make mistakes individually and collectively and we suffer for it. But in the very sources of evil lie the grounds of hope. Because there is change and because there is choice, man has the chance to effect his own rescue and often does so. . . . Viewed on a scale of epochs, we see that life advances: on a scale of decades or centuries, human affairs may stand still or move backwards."¹

Governmental policy of *laissez-faire* towards individual behaviour may be changing whether for better or for worse. In the Services, so called, men are coerced to behave according to certain standards and, at least in time of war, more and more of the population submit to the positive as well as the negative dictates of the State. Admittedly this state of affairs is artificial and there may well be a strong reaction from it when war ends. However, under the stimulus of the fear of defeat with all its consequences on the negative side and desire for the triumph of their own particular country with all the resultant advantages on the other hand, many are willing to submit to discipline imposed by the State. It would not seem impossible that, with further advances in human wisdom, more and more individuals would submit to the corporate social conscience which E. B. Bax envisaged, if that conscience framed its rules with real insight and foresight for the greater good of all, in things that really mattered, with a minimum of interference with the individual in non-essentials.

Catholic Coercion

Two experiments have already been made in this direction in the course of comparatively recent history, one which it must be admitted to have turned out to be a relative failure and the other, which so far as our knowledge goes, seems to have been a relative success. The first was the effort of the Catholic Church to exercise a moral suasion over all mankind and to establish not only a negative sanction, but also a positive control over human behaviour. Her apologists say that she was well on the way towards success in achieving this object, in what they regard as the golden age of mediævalism. While allowing for certain excellences of the mediæval Church few dispassionate observers would be likely to agree that on the whole her influence promoted the progress of mankind. Most people regard the mediæval period as a dark age, from which mankind was rescued by the Protestant Reformation and the consequent reforms in the Church itself and by the secular Renaissance of the fifteenth century. It would appear that neither the Church nor

¹ Lord Samuel: *Belief and Action*, p. 209.

the people were ready for such a universal spiritual organization at the time and the experiment broke down in face of the usual deadweight of individual and collective greed, pride and selfishness, which overshadowed the altruistic social reforms which may have been the original policy of the Church.

The Soviet Experiment

The second example is the reconstitution of Russia, for the rapid conversion of Japan in the last fifty years of the nineteenth century, from a mediæval feudalism to a modern militaristic power, scarcely comes into the same category, although it must have meant a remarkable and wholesale submission of the people to the dictates of the State. So far as Russia is concerned, the change is still more remarkable, as has been shown by the nation's unexpected efficiency in war, but it has been confined to Russia, and although the changes have probably benefited the masses on the whole, these changes were not brought about without a great deal of cruelty and consequent suffering. So far most people have had to judge of the efficiency of the Russian nation by their achievements in war, which may not be the best criterion of social progress. Her admirers, however, maintain that the advances in social administration outshine the efficiency of her war machine, but perhaps we are still too close to events to be able to pass a final judgment. This is not the place to discuss the Russian experiment and in any case much, perhaps too much, has appeared in print on this subject and some of the literature is prejudiced and ill-informed.

The Contribution of Democracy in this Country

It may be much more profitable to review what has been done by the State on behalf of the ordinary citizen in our own democratic country up to the present. Much has been done and we may note with gratification:

"The growth of sympathy such as marks the humanitarian movement, characteristic of the last hundred years, the diminution of that callous cruelty in which men were content to inflict suffering on others, are true progress. The civilisation of the penal code is true progress. In each of these there is a movement away from that crude selfishness which sharply contrasts the self and others, which acquiesces in the infliction on others of what would be passionately resented if inflicted on the self, which greedily grasps for self what is thereby unattainable for others. Such greed continues and in our bad economic order is made almost synonymous with efficiency. But conscious cruelty is really diminished. The world is effectively persuaded that all forms of malignity and antagonism of person against person are genuinely bad. . . . Perhaps it will go on to learn that greed and acquisitiveness is no less an evil, though it has hardly begun to learn that yet. And in all this learning there is real progress, real approximation to conformity with the Divine."¹

¹ W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 394.

If the Beveridge report is implemented, the volume of social service seems likely to be markedly increased. Many services are available and it is perhaps necessary to lay some stress on the word available, since no one is compelled to take advantage of the majority of these unless he so desires, except that the citizen is restrained if he suffers from communicable disease or serious mental impairment, and certain classes are compelled to contribute to insurance against sickness and unemployment.

Many people do not take advantages of the services which are offered by the State, partly from ignorance of their existence, partly from laziness and indifference and partly because some people are always prone to stress the mistakes and to take trouble to pick out the chaff amongst the grain and so become prejudiced against any and every service offered to them, however generally beneficial this may be.

Most of these services are directed to the maintenance of health and economic security and all too little to the æsthetic side of life. As a nation we are apt to regard the first as more important, because it is supposed to be more practical, though whether such a view is entirely correct is quite another matter. On the whole, it seems difficult for us to realize that Beauty may be of equal importance to Truth and Goodness.

The Field of Eugenics

The services of the State have not developed far in this country in the field of eugenics, but in some States of the U.S.A. an attempt is being made to introduce voluntary or even compulsory sterilization in an effort to control the reproduction of the unfit. A certificate of freedom from hereditary disease is sometimes required before marriage can be legalized, the object being, of course, to prevent a child being brought into the world with an irremediable handicap. Although in theory such practices would seem to be beneficial, the general opinion in this country is that our knowledge is not yet sufficiently established to allow us to legislate wisely.

There are a few rare diseases, such as congenital bleeding (*haemophilia*) and one form of congenital blindness (Tay-Sachs disease), in the case of which hereditary transmission is so certain that most people would agree that some measure of control of transmission was desirable. In such a much more serious social scourge as is mental deficiency, however, it is considerably less certain that any practical good would be done at all by sterilization. It is estimated that there would be no appreciable diminution of mental defect, until all mental defectives had been sterilized for thirty generations. Even so, sporadic cases would certainly have appeared and these might be sufficiently numerous to upset all theoretical calculations. We are not yet sufficiently far-sighted to recommend such a long-term policy, even if our knowledge were so definite as to be sure that it would be effective in the direction that we desire. Further, some people argue that if defectives, who are by nature irresponsible, are deprived of the check imposed on their natural impulses by the fear of

unwanted parenthood, there would be more promiscuity amongst them even than is found already and so there would be an increase in venereal disease. However, it is more than doubtful if the defective takes such fears into consideration if he is being driven hard by his desires.

Apart from these extreme measures of voluntary and compulsory sterilization, and in spite of the opposition of the Roman Catholic Church, many local authorities provide clinics, at which the people can receive information and instruction on how to restrict their families by the various methods of birth-control, so that they may exercise some discretion in determining the size and spacing of their offspring. No doubt such enlightenment will in time help to diminish the incidence of transmissible disease.

The opponents of these clinics, apart from the Catholics, who dogmatically insist that all birth control is wrong, believe that they will result on the one hand in the increase of promiscuity and premarital intercourse, and on the other in a serious diminution of the birth-rate, especially amongst the more desirable elements of the population, but actually there seems no valid evidence that this is so. On the other hand, working mothers were often reduced to a dangerous state of weakness by too frequent and too closely consecutive pregnancies, with detrimental effects on the later children in the family.

In Russia an experiment was made to promote the same results by legalizing abortion under certain safeguards, but it seems doubtful if this method of eugenic control is likely to be particularly successful, and even if it were, whether the risk to the mother is not too great to justify it. There has been no serious suggestion that it should be adopted in this country.

Ante-Natal Care

The almost universal provision of ante-natal clinics is certainly a useful move in the reduction of maternal mortality and morbidity, which have at last been taken seriously by public health authorities all over the country. Even the law is becoming alive to the problem, for since the case of *Rex v. Bourne* it is an accepted, if not strictly legal, view that when full-time delivery of a child will seriously endanger not only the life but even the health of the mother, members of the medical profession are justified in procuring abortion. Even now maternal mortality and still more morbidity are much too high, and much of it could be avoided if the proper measures were taken in the early months of pregnancy. It is therefore very desirable to educate mothers to avail themselves more freely of the ante-natal clinics or to consult their own doctors in time, so that if there is anything wrong it can be put right and in any case advice can be given as to the management of the pregnancy. Even when all is found to be well, the mother is reassured by such examinations and the fact that she gets to know and has confidence in the doctor who will, if she wishes, look after her in her actual labour, enables her

to face her pregnancy with confidence and hope, instead of, as is too often the case, with despondency and fear.

There is just one aspect of the propaganda campaign to popularize the ante-natal clinics that may not be always favourable; that is that in the effort to gain support and so money for the service, too much may be said about the dangers of childbirth, so creating nervousness in the minds of some mothers which may cause them to shirk a pregnancy, which would otherwise be welcome. Such a danger is, however, more theoretical than practical and once the benefits of the ante-natal clinics are appreciated, and they are now almost universally appreciated, it will automatically disappear.

The object of the national maternity service is to ensure that every woman in childbirth shall have the services of a trained midwife, who can call in a doctor at the request of the mother, and must do so in case of any difficulty or abnormal event intervening in the course of labour. In all cases the choice of doctor should be left to the mother, who will normally call in the practitioner who has been looking after her in the course of her pregnancy. This service is already very nearly complete and on the whole it works well. As a result there is little doubt that the nation is getting healthier mothers and healthier infants. The occasional difficulties which arise between midwife and doctor are not serious and only represent the stresses of personality in those who have not yet learnt to sink their own feelings of envy or their desire for power, for the common good.

The present insufficiency of hospital beds to allow of the admission of all women who require specialist skill is a difficulty more marked in some places than in others, but should be reduced from two directions in the near future. The proposed regionalization of hospitals should prevent a great deal of waste and overlapping and will eventually result in making a great many more hospital beds of all sorts, including maternity beds, available for those who really need them. On the other hand the greater success of the health services as a whole and especially the orthopædic services, together with the virtual disappearance of rickets, as a result of better understanding of the dietetic requirements of the people, should do much to make difficult labour much less common than it is to-day.

Maternity and Child Welfare

Once the baby is born, he and his mother have access to the maternity and child welfare services. The object of these is not the treatment of established illness, which can be left to the medical profession whether they are working as general practitioners or specialists in children's departments, but the maintenance of the health of the child and the supervision of his nutrition and growth. In the course of this supervision the mother is given sound practical advice on the hygiene of her child, and the fantastic mistakes in feeding and general management, not

uncommonly made by the ignorant mother, are avoided. At the same time the beginnings of illness can be detected, so that the requisite treatment can be instituted at a time when it can be really effective.

The maternity and child welfare services are designed to cover the period of the child's life from birth to the end of the second year. After this there has been a gap in the health supervision, until the youngster has to go to school at the age of five. It was supposed that between these years the child is less subject to illnesses than at other times, and that the family doctor can do all that is necessary. It has been found, however, that this is far from being the case and the new education proposals envisage the provision of nursery schools, in which adequate medical supervision can be carried out. It remains to be seen whether the provision of crèches, where working mothers can leave their infants while they are engaged on their day's work, will survive the war, but if so, then medical supervision ought to be one of the services provided at these crèches, if only to regulate nutrition and detect the insidious onset of disease.

If a child is actually suffering from an illness at the time he leaves the clinic, or indeed at any other time while he is under supervision, he can be referred either to his family doctor, or to a children's department of a hospital, or to one of the special clinics, to be mentioned presently, so that the risk of a young child suffering from a preventable illness is rapidly being reduced to a minimum.

The School Child

Once the child reaches the age of five the State insists that until he reaches the age of fifteen at least, shortly to be raised to sixteen, he shall be educated, and the State is prepared to undertake this education for all classes if they so wish. During this period, until he leaves school, the child is periodically examined by a member of the school medical service, to ensure the maintenance of his health and to continue the supervision of his nutrition and growth. As at present worked, it is not difficult to find things to criticize in this service, on the grounds that medical examinations are not sufficiently frequent or thorough, with the result that illness sometimes obtains a fast hold in spite of it. While there is some reason for these criticisms, especially in some areas, it does not alter the fact that the State does provide this service for the welfare of the individual and, furthermore, is willing to enhance this service in a practical way, by giving free milk and partly or wholly subsidized meals to schoolchildren, if it can be shown that for economic or other reasons the child cannot be properly nourished without them.

Education

In exactly the same way it is possible to criticize the education provided by the State. Some people maintain that it does not begin soon enough and does not go on long enough, that it does not provide

sufficient cultural background, to make intelligent human beings, that it does not take enough trouble to fit the child for the particular occupation which he wishes to follow and so on. It would certainly seem that all these objections are met in the recent Act for the reform of education, which has obtained such a favourable reception from all political parties. Nursery schools are to be established on a large scale, the school-leaving age is to be raised to fifteen and later to sixteen and the choice of secondary schools, which can be entered, should provide for all requirements in an adequate preparation for life.

If a child is sufficiently gifted there is no real obstacle to his proceeding to a university by means of scholarships and grants. The State provides grants in aid for the universities and for the Workers' Educational Association, which undertakes adult education, and contributes to research by maintaining the Medical Research Council and the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research. In fact, it may be said with reasonable confidence, nowadays, that any child with a sufficiency of brains can be trained for any walk in life for which he is fitted, whatever may be the economic status of the parents, though it must be admitted that some professions are less easy to enter than others, especially for women. Nevertheless the idea of equal educational opportunity for all is firmly implanted in the public mind and it should not be long before it is actually operative in practice. So far as women are concerned, however, it is complicated by the custom in some professions for them to cease to engage in remunerative work on marriage. This makes parents hesitate to provide the means, which often involves considerable family sacrifice, to enable their daughters to undertake prolonged courses of instruction, such as is necessary for medicine, since they expect that they will marry, when all the expense may be apparently wasted. The ban on the employment of married women in peace-time was due to the wide prevalence of unemployment. If, however, as has happened in war-time, there is no shortage of jobs, there seems no reason why, if they so desire, women should not continue in employment after marriage. Indeed, in several professions, especially those connected with many social services, married women would be specially fitted for the work involved.

It may be noted that this compulsory education up to a relatively advanced age effectively prevents the exploitation of child labour, which was such an evil in the early days of the industrial revolution, but which, with machine power rapidly replacing man power, so as to threaten full adult employment unless this is carefully organized, is not likely to present a problem in the future.

Handicapped Children

While this general supervision of the health and welfare of the child is going on, the local authority also makes provision for the blind, the deaf, the cripple and other handicapped children. Eye clinics afford the opportunity to examine all cases of defective vision and to provide

spectacles for those who, with their help, can take advantage of education in ordinary schools, which would otherwise be beyond their capacity.

Special schools are provided for those, whose defect of sight is so complete or so serious, that they cannot hope to keep up with their normal fellows.

Similarly the ear, nose and throat clinics detect the completely or seriously deaf and these are catered for in special schools. Those less seriously affected are brought back to normal or near normal by the removal of adenoids and tonsils or by treatment of the ear, the expense of which is borne by the local authority, whether in their own hospitals or by arrangement with the local voluntary hospital.

Orthopædic clinics are now being established in most centres of population, with a central specially staffed hospital in some convenient town, whose patients are for the most part maintained by the authority concerned. Many crippled children require long periods of treatment in hospital and, during their stay, it is imperative that their education should not be neglected; consequently they are taught while in hospital by teachers who are specially trained for this work, whose salary is met by a special grant from the Board of Education. All such children on discharge from hospital require supervision for a long time and arrangements are made by the local authorities, whereby children suffering from physical deformity, whether they have been in the central hospital or not, are brought to clinics where they are seen by specially trained nurses at frequent intervals and orthopædic surgeons who visit the clinics regularly at less frequent intervals and who are generally members of the central hospital staff, so that continuity of treatment is assured.

In the case of two other disabilities of childhood, the public services are quite inadequate, but plans to make good this deficiency are already entertained and only wait translation into action. The first of these disabilities is epilepsy. Much more provision for the supervision and treatment of epileptic children is required and authorities have so far been slow to make that provision, probably because up to the present, treatment has not held out much hope of positive results. A few colonies and institutions exist but they are quite inadequate to meet the demand. Now that we are beginning to understand more about epilepsy, the public will think it worth while to do more for these unfortunates. More provision is being made under the new Education Act. The second condition is rheumatic heart disease and for this the provision is even more scanty. Children afflicted with this condition are by no means necessarily hopelessly handicapped for life and with long treatment and adequate supervision can be fitted for much useful work. It is to be hoped that a system similar to that established for the orthopædic cripple will be made available for children suffering from damaged hearts, and already local authorities are becoming alive to this need by establishing special heart clinics.

The excuse for the incompleteness of health services is always lack

of money and in the past it has been left to the voluntary associations to make the experiments and do the pioneer work and only when a service has been proved to be really worth while have the authorities shouldered financial responsibility. Such services should not be left to the somewhat precarious support of charity and we must look forward to the time when public opinion will not only cheerfully agree, but will insist, that the State will spend as much money on life and health as on death and destruction.

Infectious Diseases

As infectious diseases occur so often in the early decades of life, this may be the place to mention provisions made by local government for the treatment and isolation of all those of all ages who are suffering from communicable disease. Special hospitals are provided for this purpose and in ordinary circumstances the available accommodation is adequate, but in the event of a serious epidemic, local arrangements might be greatly strained, but with co-operation between neighbouring areas there should be no insurmountable difficulty.

In the case of tuberculosis, however, the situation is different. We are at present apt to deceive ourselves that the great white scourge is held; that the great amount of work, which has undoubtedly been done in the establishment of clinics for ascertainment and follow-up and the provision of sanatoria for treatment, is enough. There is no doubt that we have been much too complacent and much more is required, for the conditions of war have proved what many previously suspected, that the provisions are, in fact, grossly inadequate, but again it is not the principle which is denied, but the money which is withheld. The above applies not only to tuberculosis of the lungs but to other tubercular diseases as well. Although provision is made under the orthopædic schemes for tubercular disease of bones and joints in children, very little is done for similar conditions in adults.

Venereal Diseases

The other great group of communicable diseases are the venereal diseases. Since these seldom require in-patient hospital treatment, authorities have provided clinics to which sufferers from these diseases can go for treatment, a considerable measure of secrecy being maintained. The patient is therefore not deterred from seeking treatment, because he is afraid of advertising the fact that he has contracted a disease, for the having of which he is entirely responsible. The results of the establishment of these clinics have undoubtedly been good. Individual patients have been cured and the risk of transmission has been definitely lessened. There is now a move on foot to compel a patient who has started treatment to complete this, as it has been found that in some cases the patient is content with the removal of the most acute and obvious symptoms, and does not persevere long enough to effect a complete cure or even to

render himself free from infection. Complete success will not be attained, however, till more humanity and sympathy are shown to those who have contracted these diseases, sometimes quite innocently.

A Comprehensive National Health Service

After a child leaves school, unless he is a cripple or otherwise under the medical care of the State, there is again a gap in the provision for his welfare by public authorities. If, at the age of sixteen, he becomes a wage-earner, he comes under the benefit of the National Health Insurance scheme whereby, out of funds provided by the individual himself, the employer and the State, he is given a maintenance grant while sick, he is provided with domiciliary medical attention by his family doctor and most of the necessary drugs and appliances to effect his cure. This service is available for all wage-earners with an income of less than £420 per annum.

That this scheme is not complete is admitted by everyone; but a comprehensive health service for the nation is now on the statute book. This provides for an extension of the insurance scheme to include the whole nation. Thus there will be a service not only for those actually in employment, but also for their dependants and for anyone else who wishes to take advantage of the scheme. It is also proposed to extend specialist benefits, so that all sorts of diagnostic procedures and all methods of treatment are available for everyone. Some are in favour of a wholtime salaried medical service, as the most practical and simple way of providing a complete service for everyone, but the Act does not provide for this.

All reformers are insistent that the hospital services of the country require to be regrouped and reorganized, so that every member of the community should have the benefit of the services of the skilled staff working with all the amenities of a modern hospital. There is at present a good deal of overlapping and reduplication of expensive equipment and there can be no doubt that there is much room for greater efficiency and economy of working. A scheme for the reform of hospital services and their reorganization on a regional basis was formulated by the Nuffield Trust and has been largely incorporated in the new Act.

Industrial Medicine

A new development of health service is to be found in the increasing organization of industrial medicine. A new class of specialist doctor is growing up, whose duties are to study the particular problems of individual and general health pertaining in our large factories. These doctors not only look after the health matters in the narrow sense, but also co-operate closely with the welfare workers, who look after the general amenities of life in these factories. Although much of this work is left to the enterprise of individual firms, there are indications that the State is likely to insist on their universal application. This presumably means that it will make substantial contributions to their maintenance.

Employment—Conditions of Work

Not only is the health of the worker at least partially insured by the State scheme of National Health Insurance, but his employment is also provided for by the setting up of labour exchanges to find him employment and in so far as insurance against unemployment can be said to be such a provision. Many of the left wing in politics think that, instead of providing a meagre, frequently inadequate support for those that fall out of work, the State should undertake the control of industry and provide employment at a living wage for all members of the community. This was the object of the Communist regime in Russia, but it has not been completely realized and in some respects the change over has regressed rather than advanced in recent years. Others, generally of the right wing, do not agree with this, holding that it is an uneconomic proposition, which would lead to slackness and waste and too much bureaucratic control and that industry is better administered under individual competitive control. The truth is that both systems are liable to abuses and that both could succeed if perfectly run, but with such disputes we have nothing to do here. All that concerns us is that the State has undertaken a scheme, which may or may not be completely adequate, to ensure that those who are not working shall not fall into actual want. In addition, the State has undertaken a scheme for the retraining of unemployed persons when work in their own trade seems unlikely to be available. Grants in aid have also been made to the National Council of Social Services to assist in the establishment of clubs for the unemployed.

So far as industry itself is concerned, the countenance and support given by the State to the Trade Unions, which are a development from the old voluntary Friendly Societies, ensures that the conditions of work and wages in any particular industry shall be reasonably fair. The system of factory inspection, restriction of hours of work, compulsory holidays and so forth ensure that they shall be reasonably hygienic. The provision of labour exchanges in all large centres ensures that those who lose their employment are given help and advice in order to obtain other work, if such is available, and, at the same time, these institutions prevent abuse of the unemployment scheme.

Social Services

For those who do not come within the benefits of any of these schemes, the old Poor Law, which has been in operation with various modifications for well over a hundred years, made some sort of provision, whereby those with no means of support should at least be given a roof over their heads, some food and hospital care when necessary. Everyone who has read *Oliver Twist* knows how, under the influence of an inefficient bureaucracy, this system developed abuses, which made it hated by the people who might have benefited by it and despised by everyone concerned. The Act of 1929 endeavoured to dispel the stigma of parish relief and, although prejudice dies hard, this has already been achieved

to some extent. The Public Assistance Committees, or as they are now to be called, the Social Service Committees, of the various local authorities can give grants in aid, in money or in kind, to families who are in want. They provide hospitals, devoted chiefly at the present time to the care of chronic cases and old people, though as has already been mentioned, if the proposed reorganization of hospitals takes place, this distinction of the municipal hospital for chronic cases and the voluntary hospital for acute cases will largely disappear. Domiciliary medical service by the district medical officer is available for all those who wish to avail themselves of it, so that in theory, even now, there is no member of the community who cannot obtain medical services, either free or by means of an insurance scheme. Actually the district medical officers are only made use of by the very poor and they could not in fact undertake the treatment of everyone who is legally entitled to make use of their services. Some reorganization of the medical services of the nation is therefore necessary and, as has been said, much discussion is taking place as to how this can best be effected.

Provision for Old Age

In the old days, when people were too old to work, they had either to be supported by the younger members of the family, or they had to go to the poorhouse, where even husbands and wives were separated in different blocks. This was one of the chief defects of the old poor law and caused great distress and discontent, but the State has now made provision for old age, by the system of the old age pension. To this, every contributor to the unemployment insurance scheme is entitled at the age of sixty-five and all others at seventy. This is all that has so far been considered economically possible but there are, of course, criticisms that the money received is not enough to keep these old people in reasonable comfort and that many workers, especially women, are incapable of earning long before they are seventy or even sixty-five. To meet these criticisms the Pensions Act of 1940 provided for grants in excess of 10s. per week when necessity is shown. Insured women receive pensions at sixty and pensions are given to the widows and orphans of insured men. More recently, the basic pension has been increased to 26s. per week.

Mental Health

So far, we have discussed the provision made for the physical ill-health of the community, but have said nothing about the mental side. It was recognized at a very early stage of social legislation that the State must take responsibility for those who, in their own interests or in that of the community as a whole, required to be deprived of their liberty and freedom of action, because they were a danger to themselves or to others or who were unable by reason of mental infirmity to look after and support themselves in the community and whose relatives were not in an economic position to make their own arrangements for their care. A statutory

body, the Board of Control, was appointed to look after the interests of all those patients, whether they were a charge on the State or on their own relatives.

In order to preserve the principle of the liberty of the subject and individual freedom, the transference of people from their own charge to that of the State, or, in the case of children from the charge of their guardians, was made contingent on the granting of a certificate of Mental Deficiency or Lunacy within the provisions of certain acts of Parliament. This certificate is granted by a magistrate acting under medical advice. While this provision undoubtedly prevented certain abuses which might well have arisen, it did prevent many mental invalids, whose restricted means prevented them making private arrangements and who urgently required care and treatment, from obtaining them. This was because their relatives, who must initiate the request for certification, wished at all costs to avoid the "stigma" of their being confined in a lunatic asylum. By new legislation therefore the State is now prepared to undertake care and treatment, without certification, of those who voluntarily submit themselves for such treatment and also of certain people who, though unable to express volition themselves, as a result of their temporary mental derangement, are, in the opinion of two medical practitioners, likely to recover within a reasonable time.

In many places out-patient clinics have been established, where mild or early cases who do not require hospitalisation may be seen and patients discharged from hospital can be supervised. Many voluntary hospitals have also established departments, where patients suffering from psychoneuroses and mild insanity can be dealt with either as in-patients or out-patients. In the case of both lunatics and mental defectives, much use is made of treatment by occupation and efforts are directed to rehabilitate the patient so that he can wholly or partially resume his place in industry or at least in the general life of the community.

In the case of Mental Deficiency, State care was complicated by the fact that all more severe cases and others not of school age, i.e. 7-16, were dealt with by one authority, the Mental Deficiency Committees, while in the milder cases of deficiency in children of school age, administration was in the hands of the Education Authority. The reason given for this is that the main problem is to teach such children in special schools, within the limits of their capacity. Under the new Act the Education Authority is only concerned with providing education. In treating mental defectives the main stress is and should be on occupation and rehabilitation and those who have to be provided for are housed, not in hospitals, but in working colonies, where they learn to feel that, though it may only be to a limited extent, they are making some contribution to community life.

Child Guidance

The latest advance is the establishment by an increasing number of local authorities (over 80 now in Great Britain) of Child Guidance Clinics. In these, children who are not mentally defective, but who, in one way or another, are finding difficulty in adapting to life or in advancement in learning, are investigated and treated. It is hoped by this work to prevent the development of adult mental invalidism by treating it in its incipient stages and also to check the incidence of crime, by investigating its causes and first manifestations. It is too early to estimate the effects of this work in accomplishing its more ambitious objects, but there can be no doubt that it does a great deal of good in removing much unhappiness, bad behaviour and inefficiency amongst children and in preventing much unnecessary obstruction to normal education in the schools.

Psychological Aspect of Crime

While on the subject of crime, it may be pointed out that the State or Authority, whatever its form might be, which ruled any country, has always undertaken to restrain and punish asocial behaviour and to settle disputes between the citizens by establishing Courts of Justice to try the case and set up penal establishments of one sort and another where, if the accused is found guilty, he may be punished. It is only recently, however, that any real effort has been made to discover the causes of crime and the psychological reactions of criminals, so as to control its incidence and prevent its recurrence.

“It is my belief that the real deterrent against crime is social opinion. It is not the police nor the laws. It is the healthy public opinion which surrounds a man from his youth.”¹

Nowadays, we are beginning to treat crime from the medical standpoint, as Samuel Butler was one of the first to suggest. The Home Office is responsible for this work and much has been done in rearranging and improving the penal establishments and in investigating the social, physical and psychological state of the inmates. At the same time, by the establishment of Juvenile Courts and the promotion of special legislation for dealing with the young offender, much preventive and remedial work is being done at the age at which alone it can hope to be effective.

Other State Responsibilities

In addition to all the direct measures for the maintenance of the public health, the State promotes the same object by many indirect services, such as the control of immigration at ports so that foreign epidemic diseases shall be prevented from gaining access to the country,

¹ Lord Buckmaster: *Evidence before a Select Committee of the House of Commons*, 26th March, 1930.

whether by human or by animal carriers, as for example in the case of smallpox on the one hand and plague on the other. In addition, the State undertakes to maintain the purity of food, the disposal of sewage and refuse and to regulate the conditions of housing. The state has built 1,500,000 houses since the last war, many of which are let at an uneconomic rent, and schemes for reconditioning depressed areas and replanning our cities are in active preparation.

At the same time, in many instances, it maintains public utilities—post offices everywhere, lighting by gas and electricity in many places, transport by tram and bus and although the railways in this country are not yet under direct State control, they are subject to a certain amount of State supervision and direction, especially in times of national emergency.

Leisure

Recently, the State has started to pay attention to the proper use of the leisure of the community by giving grants in aid to various youth services and to the National Council for Social Services to provide village halls and Community Centres. They contribute to the same end by the provisions of the licencing laws, which to some extent control the consumption of alcohol and by the establishing of playing fields, parks and open spaces, not only in the towns, but through the National Trust in the country as well. Measures are also undertaken to prevent social abuses by the control of traffic in dangerous drugs and the regulation of prostitution and disreputable houses.

The Æsthetic Side of Life

It has often been a reproach in this country, that far too little attention has been paid to the æsthetic side of life, but something is being done by the preservation, under the direction of the Office of Works, of ancient buildings of æsthetic and historical value. The National Trust purchases or preserves natural beauty spots, many of which are left to it by their owners who wish the best of the countryside to be preserved from the speculative builders. Both the State and the local authorities have for a long time now concerned themselves with forming collections of representative works of art in their public galleries. Many local authorities have also followed the example of the State in establishing museums and libraries, where the populace as a whole can continue their education or employ their leisure to advantage. In addition, many agencies which organise adult education from universities downwards enjoy the benefits of State subsidies and grants. We still await, however, a national theatre, a national opera house and a nationally supported chain of concert halls, where drama and music could be presented to the people at prices within the reach of all. Nevertheless, the B.B.C., which is to some extent a national institution, has done a very great deal to provide entertainment for the masses and to educate them in æsthetic taste and appreciation.

Mention should certainly be made of the Board set up for the National encouragement of Music and Art by the Board of Trade and the Pilgrim Trust.

Charity and Voluntary Effort

In this discussion the social activities of the State have been briefly surveyed and no mention has been made of the immense numbers of charitable and voluntary associations and institutions which supplement and amplify these social services. It has been the custom with us and has been one which, on the whole, has worked well, to allow the experimental and pioneering services to be undertaken by the voluntary associations. Then, if and when these have proved their worth, the burden of their maintenance has been transferred to the tax-payer through central or local authorities. This seems just, so long as there was a sufficiency of spare cash to finance these pioneering efforts, but in these days of high taxation and with the enormous expenditure of the war to pay for, it may well be that the State will have to undertake the pioneering services as well as maintaining those which are well established.

Some people with a conservative spirit are apt to deplore this very large amount of more or less free social service, which has grown to much greater proportions than many people realise, comparing it to the *panis et circenses*, which, they say, marked the degenerative period of the Roman Empire. This, however, is a one-sided and erroneous view, for it would seem that in Rome, at least under many of the Emperors, the custom of giving the people *panis et circenses* was aimed at hoodwinking the commons and keeping them quiet, while they were still further exploited and still more ground down into a condition of slavery. Social services instituted for such purposes cannot be anything but evil. But if, as we have every right to believe, our own social services are directed towards ameliorating the lot of the people and raising them to a condition of greater general happiness, then they do represent real progress. Admittedly, mistakes have been made and bad administration has stultified good intention, as happened with the old Poor Law, yet in these democratic days, when our reformers watch lynx-eyed over the deeds of each and every government, there is little risk of really serious regression or *mal-praxis*, for in a democratic country it is indeed impossible to fool all the people all the time, and the people in the end have the remedy in its own hand. Moreover, men and women as a whole possess an inherent urge to mutual help, whatever the individual may feel, and the people are prepared to fight for it and to go on fighting for it.

"If this life is not a real fight, in which something is eternally gained for the universe by success, it is no better than a game of private theatricals, from which one may withdraw at will. But it feels like a real fight—as if there was something really wild in the universe, which we, with all our idealities and faithfulnesses, were needed to redeem."¹

¹ Andre Chenier.

THE GOAL OF PROGRESS

FROM what has been recorded in the last chapter, most people would agree that we had achieved a considerable measure of social progress in the last 100 or 150 years, but we should never forget the general principles, according to which we should estimate progress. For too many people progress has meant increasing wealth, an increase in the number and variety of commodities available for the use and the enjoyment of the human race, and an increase of communication. All this material progress may be very valuable, but it will only accentuate progress towards happiness, which has already been envisaged in this discussion as the ultimate end of endeavour, if it is very wisely used.

The Use of Leisure

Actually the practical result of all material progress ought to be an increase of leisure, but too often new activities are born of the old, not all of which are beneficial, and so leisure is decreased rather than increased. Life was so strenuous for primitive man that his whole time, or very nearly his whole time, was taken up in providing for the bare necessities of life. To work for his very existence, to eat and to sleep were all he could do in the 24 hours of each day. Now we have, or ought to have, ample leisure for all sorts of other activities and indeed the insistence on the eight-hour working day as the normal standard ensures that we do have this leisure. How we use this leisure is perhaps the most important single factor in the difference between happiness and misery. If this leisure is used for the pursuit of knowledge in our progress towards Truth, for the appreciation and making of Beauty, both in our environment and in ourselves and for doing all we can to bring happiness to other people, then all is well, but if it is used, as it so often is, for purely selfish individual pleasure, or for the pursuit of material things only, then all is not well. After all, material wealth ought to make for more opportunities for a better and more gracious life, but too often a vicious circle of money making and restless activity in spending it to no useful purpose is set up and leisure is never achieved.

Still, considering the little leisure enjoyed by our ancestors, we may regard it as remarkable that they were ever able to start the process which has led to the appreciation of Truth, Beauty and Goodness and that we have gone so far along the road to real progress. In the hurly-burly of modern life it rather looks as if we are being carried on by the inertia of the drive to make more leisure, which must have been present during the childhood of the race. We seem to have lost sight of the real

object in view. This object is not only to achieve leisure but to use it wisely when we have got it.

“The wisdom of a learned man cometh by opportunity of leisure and he that hath little business shall become wise.”¹

The Evolution of Zest

Certain impulses in the human race have produced the drive for progress, but, if we are not careful, these impulses themselves may shape the goal of this progress, and what is beneficial as a driving force is not always equally beneficial as an end in itself. In his primitive state man had to work or perish, and doubtless the idlers were very soon eliminated. This would by natural selection favour those with enterprise, to breed and hand on their qualities, which would seem to have been compounded of aggressiveness or self-assertion, curiosity and probably, since the capture of a mate and the procreation of the next generation was essential for survival, sex. The primitive, who wished to rise above his fellows, was one who was possessed of rather more aggressiveness and self-assertion, what we may call zest, than the average. He would be more successful, moreover, if his curiosity drove him to fare forth from his ancestral cave or village, to make himself master of more remote regions and discover more opportunities for his enterprise. This is the spirit which has driven the pioneer, especially of the northern less fertile lands, to seek new and more profitable pastures. These impulses have driven men forth to colonise and dominate, from the times of the ancient Norsemen to the emigrating Scot of the present day. These pioneers would also attract the more enterprising and adventurous women and they would therefore rear an enterprising race. Buckle in his history of civilisation has drawn attention to this, showing that, where nature is abundant, man may multiply, but he tends to stagnate in two opposed classes of tyrant and slave, whereas in these countries where nature is niggardly, the freeman will flourish, and the free man will always come out on the top in the end. All this is to the good, provided that zest is used to promote the benefit of the community and not that of the individual only.

The Influence of Pity

When this has happened, however, we may find something of a paradox, which puts a break on this breeding of men and women possessed of enterprise and zest. The newcomers settle down in their newly won territory and, while their stock remains relatively pure, continue to work with great energy and determination. Their circumstances make it no longer necessary to apply all this energy in the gathering of the bare necessities and it is turned into other channels. Now the other great impulse to mutual help calls for expression and they turn their attention to improving the lot of those less fortunate, because less energetic, than themselves.

¹ Ecclesiasticus xxxviii.

"The force of evolution is now understood by the human awareness of this century as the urge, felt in some degree, at some time, by every human being, towards the common goal of human amelioration and human freedom."¹

This, of course, is desirable, but instead of bestowing all their energy in promoting their own good qualities, turned perhaps in a different direction, it often happens that the people most ready to hand as recipients of their benevolent energy are far less strong and able themselves. Moved as much by pity as by love, the strong will marry with the weak and the stock deteriorates to an inefficient mediocrity. It is true that zest may be perverted in its objects and lead to evil effects, but without zest there can be no progress. Therefore anything which tends to diminish the zest of humanity is a serious menace to the future and this raises a very real problem of our times. This can only be answered by a much more serious consideration of the science of Eugenics and of selective breeding. Man will have to apply this to himself with as much care as he applies it to the raising the quality of the stock of his domestic animals.

The Gradual Improvement of the Race

It has been pointed out that selective breeding may in time bring all the animal kingdom into harmony in a system of life favourable to man and that in looking forward to this we must not be sentimental. If man is at the head and forefront of life on this planet at present, he must have the courage of his convictions that this is so and take his position and responsibilities seriously. He has got to consider his race before he considers himself. If the tiger is inimical to the harmonious whole, however noble and beautiful he is, the tiger must go and we must not listen to those who on some ill-formed theory would seek to save him. If a human weakling is obstructive to progress he must eventually be eliminated. It may be said that this is one of the Nazi doctrines which we deplore, but it is not the end to which we object, it is the method used. All this cannot be done at once; we must be patient. There is no need to murder the individual, but it is necessary to persuade people that they should think carefully as to what sort of individual they are going to bring into the world. At present the science of Eugenics is in its infancy, and we have a long way to go before we shall have sufficient wisdom to put our theories into really effective practice. But it really is necessary to see to it that, by thoughtless marriage, we should not degenerate the stock.

Our first task is to formulate a prototype of the goal of our efforts. Many attempts have been made to do this, but, for example, Nietzsche's superman of power is not acceptable as the ideal to be aimed at and the unpopularity and failure of the German doctrine of the *Herrenvolk* has proved that he is not; nor is the ascetic, non-co-operative, non-aggressive passive resister of the Hindu Gandhi's philosophy.

¹ J. C. Young: *Individual Psychology, Psychiatry and Holistic Medicine*.

The Perfect Man

It is doubtful if anyone would be prepared or able to define exactly the perfect man, who ought to be the objective for the whole race, but the basis of such a superman should be something after the following pattern. He must not lack any of the primary instincts but they must all be sublimated, that is to say they must be controlled, integrated and modified, so that his personality works as a harmonious whole. He must not lack fear, for he must be prudent, he must not lack sex, for he must preserve and continue his race, he must not lack aggression, for he must have enterprise, he must not lack curiosity, for he must discover new things and he must be capable of self abasement, for he requires to be reverent, a quality in the human make-up which we shall have to consider more carefully later on. Exactly how all these qualities are to be combined and distributed we do not yet know; much more trial and error is needed before we can formulate the equation which will give us the formula for the perfect man. Always, whether we are planning our own lives or the characteristics of the race, we must keep before our eyes Truth, Beauty and Goodness as our guides, and the happiness of the greatest number as our aim. The combination of qualities of our ideal man must have this for their objective.

The Task of the Supermen

When we have got our race of supermen, their task will be to find leisure and to use it in such a way as to promote the happiness of all. We have advanced some way in this direction and so far this advance has been chiefly towards Truth. The great increase in scientific knowledge and achievement, which has resulted, has overshadowed and largely bounded our efforts. In primitive times this advancement took the form of attempts to dominate the four "elements," earth, water, fire and air. As has already been shown, it was the harnessing of fire which was the foundation of all progress towards the conquering of the environment. This same line of inquiry gave rise to the basic sciences of chemistry and physics, which were already reasonably advanced at the time of the Sumerians and the Ancient Egyptians. Biology, the study of life itself, owes its scientific birth to Aristotle, and has been associated in more recent times with the other two. Chemistry and Physics have sought to explore the phenomena of life and to discover whether they will fit within the formulæ and laws which govern the part of the universe which is not commonly thought of as alive. In this they have achieved some success and there seems to be no valid reason why we should establish a hard and fast line between bodies which are not alive and those which exhibit the phenomena which we are accustomed to associate with life.

"We appear to have every guarantee for believing, that somewhere, and at some time, by a series of minor gradations, no-life has given birth to some-life, in the complex commerce of the inorganic

environment. The minimum requirement for the manifestation of any of the phenomena of life would seem to be a high degree of complexity in the structure of the molecule of the substance in which it becomes manifest. There is every reason to believe that it is in the enormous complexity and large size and the intimate special relations of the constituent atoms, that the possibility of evincing any approach to life, resides. The protein molecule alone fulfils all the requirements, and not all proteins are competent to serve this purpose. The passage from no-life to some-life and all-life appears to depend on the complexity of the ultimate structure and the consequent large size of the protein molecule."¹

So the more we know about the universe as a whole the more we may learn about man and the more we may be able to direct his ultimate progress. All these studies, therefore, have given rise to a very great body of scientific knowledge and man has tended to try to unify science and to bring it within one field of inquiry with the ultimate object of applying it to his own advantage.

Science and Man

Driven by the necessity of improving his condition of life, man has naturally sought to utilise any knowledge which he may have gained under the spur of curiosity and this has led to the wholesale application of science, which in turn has directed men's minds more and more towards material things. Applied science can have two results, to increase man's power over nature and to provide him with more power to enjoy that leisure which results from his efforts. But too often science has proved to be a mistress rather than a servant and man has been impelled, if not compelled, to leave in the air the question of how best to employ his leisure and to devote himself more and more feverishly to the study of how to acquire greater power over his environment. Modern man seems to have been caught in a vicious circle, as we shall see presently, for the application of science has resulted, for too many people, in a conception of a purely materialistic universe, with material objects as the be-all and end-all of human endeavour.

"Not knowing the high goal of our great endeavour
is spiritual attainment, individual worth,
at all cost to be sought and at all cost pursued,
to be won at all cost and at all cost assured;
not such material ease as might be attain'd for all
by cheap production and distribution of common needs
wer all life level'd down to where the lowest can reach:"²

So much has this material outlook been operative that man had almost forgotten that there could be anything else than material things and material gain.

¹ F. Wood Jones: *Design and Purpose*.

² R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, II, 204-210.

The Material and Immaterial

Recently, however, this very study of science has made a full circle and has seemed to show that the material universe, which seemed so secure and well established, is not material at all. This we must consider, for it may mean that, as a result of these theories which seem to fit the facts, we are given a chance to reconsider the whole purpose of existence and to view the leisure which science has won for us from a new angle. If we can realise that material things are not everything, we may break away from the vicious circle in which the more leisure is given to us the less effectively we are able to use it.

Chemistry and Physics are essentially founded on measurement, and measurement must be carried out first in space and then in time and later still in space-time. All knowledge seemed to be centred to begin with on positions in space and movements in space. That which had position in space was matter and that which induced a movement in space was energy. The discovery of the relationships of these two seemed to constitute the whole of natural philosophy. The metaphysicians, those who sought to pursue knowledge outside the bounds of space and time, seemed to their contemporaries in the nineteenth century, and even now to ourselves, to be following their visions into unreality and nothingness. It was held that, either the physico-chemical universe must form the bases of their discourses, or, if they could not keep themselves within its bounds, they should be regarded as unpractical and therefore scarcely worthy of consideration, at least by the majority of mankind.

Even now the man in the street would probably tell the inquirer that matter was the only real thing and that the chair on which he sits and the bench at which he works are matter and real enough for him. Energy he is aware of. He realises that he moulds matter in accordance with his will, he pushes it around, in fact, and he does this by means of energy. But what is really meant by energy, he would find it hard to define. He realises that energy of some sort is inherent in heat, in electricity, in chemical action and in life itself, for he can observe that all these "things" make other "things" happen, and therefore he presumes that the first set of "things" must exhibit energy, but that is as far as he goes.

"Things" and their Variations

Our man in the street will even follow the chemist if he likes to divide the various bits of matter into smaller and smaller particles, until he comes to what he calls atoms. He is rather mystified when the chemist tells him that form or arrangement are really more important than substance and that, for example, a diamond and a piece of coal are really the same stuff. He is puzzled when he is told that there are only some hundred different forms of atoms of elements and that all the countless myriad "things" he sees around him owe their different sizes and shapes, their different textures and properties, to different permutations and combinations of these hundred or so atoms, arranging themselves in

different forms. When he is told that in all living matter, animal and vegetable, only four elements which really matter are involved in the composition of all the various forms, he is more mystified still and may be frankly incredulous.

Still he does know that "things" do change their shape and form in the most surprising way. Every day, when he heats his water, it turns to steam and when the temperature is sufficiently low, it turns to ice. He is prepared to admit that "nature" is very wonderful, but he generally retains the firm conviction that everything can be explained, if he takes it as axiomatic that matter is something solid, which can be arranged in different ways with surprising results and that energy is something mysterious, but not solid and that by the interaction of the two the universe is made to go.

The Basis of Matter

Not so the physicist, who, taking over from the chemist, proceeded to break up the atom and in doing so found that there was no matter, only energy, that each atom consisted of a field of force, in which a greater or less number of negative charges circulated round a less number of positive charges. It should be noted that the physicist does not postulate a number of negatively and positively charged particles but only the charges themselves without any material basis. Here, then, is something very difficult for the man in the street to grasp; he is asked to believe that his beloved matter extending in space and enduring in time has no real existence and is only envisaged by him as matter, because that is the way things are presented to him through his senses.

He has to realise that his senses are only reliable as a practical means to a convenient end and that what seems to him so true and so real is neither truth nor reality. He has prided himself on his common sense and believed that common sense must lead to truth. He has to learn that while sense may be common to mankind, his senses do not necessarily lead him to ultimate truth.

His whole conception of the universe is shaken up and he may well feel that he has to formulate his philosophy of life all over again. He has now got to try and grasp exactly what energy is. So far as he can understand, it is something that moves other things about and holds things together in a framework, the framework of space-time; but the things themselves are nothing but special forms of energy. Here, then, surely there must be something to which he can hold, he can try to picture to himself this framework and this energy acting in an orderly manner inside this framework, a given amount of energy holding another "piece" of energy in, or moving it through, a constant medium. Thus, if he knows the strength of the first "piece" of energy and the direction in which it is acting, he ought to know with certainty the position of the second "piece" in a given time.

Not a bit of it, the physicist will have none of this. The man in the

street is told that we cannot be sure of cause and effect like that, because, although such cause and effect seem to work all right in the ordinary range of our experience, when we get to the very small, that is to say, when we learn what happens within the atom, or when we get to the very large, namely, what happens in the outer realm of interstellar space, cause and effect no longer seem to work and we cannot determine accurately either the position or the speed of a moving particle. Although these laws of cause and effect which we so long thought of as infallible do work for all practical purposes in our everyday life, the fact that they do not always do so is a disturbing conception in our general picture of the universe, which, as men in the street, we have been accustomed to envisage.

The Laws of Nature

It is very necessary, however, to guard against any temptation to deduce from this, as some have done, that if the laws of causality do not hold in certain ranges of observation, they do not hold anywhere and that therefore any sort of miracle can happen at any place and at any time. We must not lose sight of the fact that a vast amount of observation has shown that in the realm of ordinary common observation the so-called laws of common sense do hold and miracles do not in fact happen. The utmost that we must allow ourselves to deduce is, that we must not sanctify any law into a static expression of absolute Truth and that we must keep our minds fluid and plastic, ready to accept or reject, in accordance with the evidence before us, the exact significance of laws or so-called facts.

All that it is desired to stress here is that we must regard these laws as of less significance than they were thought to be and that we must be prepared to revise our notions of the significance of all the "things," which seem so infallible, so important and so overwhelming in our lives. Nothing in the universe is completely inevitable and so we may retain a certain fluidity in our conceptions.

Mathematics and the Universe

This is the next step which the physicist bids us take. Our friend the man in the street would maintain that he might have been wrong as to the way that "things" were influenced and behaved in space and time, but surely the "things," which were important and which he was prepared to describe as energy, if he was not allowed to call them matter, must be able to be measured in the four dimensions. They must surely have extension, they must have some sort of length and breadth and thickness and they must last through time. Surely space and time must be real; he would complain, you have taken away matter and said that it is just another way of talking about energy, surely movement and position may be left to me; but the physicist says not so. It may be very convenient to you to construct this space-time *continuum* and have your

little particles or your little waves running about in it, it is very convenient for you and for certain purposes of description, it is very convenient for me, but all this is no more than a convenience. At one time you, Mr. Man-in-the-Street, liked a three-dimensional *continuum*, now you are beginning to grasp a four-dimensional system with time as your fourth dimension. All right, but if it pleases you, or rather if it pleases me, because you would probably not be able to grasp it, I can just as easily construct for you a system of five dimensions or six dimensions or any number of dimensions you like, it is all matter of mathematical formulæ of sufficient complexity and the whole universe *from one point of view* is no more than a mathematical formula, which can be devised in the mind of a rather specially gifted human being. Note the "from one point of view"; this conception is not going to help you to grow your potatoes or build your motor car or to run your factory. What is important is that you should realise that you can consider the universe or that small part of it which makes up your environment on this earth, from more than one point of view. You may look at your own environment from your own point of view, in terms of nuts and screws and petrol and faradic currents, but that is not the only way of looking at it, since from the mathematician's point of view, the whole of this environment, which seems so real and so solid and so important, is only a mathematical formula in the mind of a man. At one moment the material aspect of things in terms of common sense, of space and time, of things which are of such and such a size and last for such and such a time is the most significant point of view, but at another the mental aspect of the whole thing in terms of a mathematical formula is the most significant. If we are thinking of particular problems of machinery, then obviously the first is most significant, but if we are thinking of universals and of values other than the things which machines will make, then perhaps the second may be more significant; and since Truth is a universal the second may be nearer to ultimate Truth than the first.

Different Points of View

So we must try to think of all sorts of problems which beset us, from more than one point of view. We must get out of the rut of applied science and think again in wider terms. Perhaps it would seem that one of the most important problems for our purpose is the old dispute as to the relationship of mind and matter. This has been radically changed by the discoveries referred to above, so much so that, whereas the old philosophers regarded this question as the most important one for man to settle, almost all thinkers of the present day consider that it is an unreal one. They maintain that there is no essential difference between mind and matter, but that the two must be considered not from the point of view of separate and definite entities, but from the point of view of the whole, different aspects of which, mind at one moment and matter at another, may present themselves for discussion.

Mind and Matter

Let us consider this for a moment. It used to be a matter of continuous dispute amongst philosophers as to what was the relationship between the two entities. In more recent times Descartes started the dispute by the famous aphorism, "*Cogito ergo sum*," "I think therefore I am," placing the stress on the idea as being the author and proof of the material being, but not advancing to any extent the solution of the problem of how they were related to each other. For Berkeley mind was the essential and matter, for all anyone could tell, was present as a sense presentation to the mind, but might not have any separate existence. Hume sought to prove that, on such a basis, there was no more reason to believe in the mind of the recipient than in the matter which was or seemed to be conveyed to the recipient by the senses. Spinoza perhaps came nearer to the modern point of view in his contention that mind and matter were but different aspects of the Divine purpose or essence, but none of these philosophers could get very near modern conceptions, because they were ignorant of, and therefore took no account of, the discoveries of modern science, especially of anatomy and physiology and of biology as a whole in relation to mind and the fact that matter can be "analysed" into a mathematical formula. They, therefore, spoke quite a different language from the scientists.

The Relationship of Brain and Mind

In modern times more stress has been laid on the relationship of brain and mind than on difference between matter and mind and science has sought to explain how far the study of the function of nerve tissue could explain all mental processes. If such an explanation were completely possible, this might have logically led to a material view of the universe, since mind would be proved to be *nothing but* a function of matter. But this would have been a false conclusion, for the theories of modern physics maintain that matter is *nothing but* a function of the mind and that the *whole* is immaterial rather than material. It is clear therefore that neither matter nor mind can be regarded as fundamental, but that they are both manifestations of some "thing" beyond both.

Even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, philosophers recognised that there was a definite connection between the two, even though the brain might only be an instrument on which the mind played, as a pianist plays on the piano; but our knowledge has now grown sufficiently to suggest that the function of the brain itself might be enough to explain the whole processes of mind, which from certain points of view most certainly exists. But that is not to say that brain is to be regarded as ultimately essentially material and therefore to be contrasted with mind which is essentially immaterial, or that there is no such thing as mind or brain since they were just a function of each other. Just as matter has been shown to be a function of energy and both expressible in terms of a mathematical formula, which is some "thing"

quite outside the bounds of space-time, so we may be able to demonstrate that mind and brain are two aspects of the same "thing." We need not postulate that this "thing" is either some "thing" to be measured and weighed, that is considered in space-time as brain, or some "thing" outside the space-time *continuum*, which we call mind. All we can say is that the brain-mind complex, just as is the matter-energy complex, is capable of being regarded from more than one point of view and that their ultimate nature is not definable in terms of contrasting parts.

For practical purposes it is obvious that for a long time to come we shall have to consider the brain-mind complex from at least two main angles, namely from that of physiology and from that of psychology and, if we were to confine ourselves to one or other of these avenues of approach, we should very seriously fetter our inquiry. We may hope that in the future these two avenues of approach, instead of diverging, and being contrasted, will fuse, so that in the distant future our knowledge will proceed along a broad path into which all lines of scientific inquiry will converge.

Perhaps this concept may be depicted in the metaphor of a physiological river and a psychological river, which join to make a mighty psychosomatic river. But this river Psychosoma will neither be all brain or all mind. We shall still be able to dip into the flood and choose to consider brain or choose to consider mind, but they will be but different aspects of the same field of study, just as matter and energy may be said to be different aspects of the same field of study.

Once we have grasped this truth, that the material and immaterial are not to be for ever contrasted, but are in fact two aspects of the same study, then we shall have really reached a considerable distance along the road of progress in knowledge. From this we shall be able to proceed to the idea that every thing, whatever it may be, may be thought of in terms of its structure and function and its utility value on the one hand and its abstract meaning and spiritual value on the other.

For the practical work of the world we must work in the space-time *continuum*, we must study science and utility, but, whereas we have in the past been too prone to consider that this is the only significant aspect of things, the only worth-while point of view, because it seemed so important, we may find ourselves shaken in this belief. Ultimately we may come to think that, while this aspect of things is and will continue to be necessary, it is not the most important aspect. If we can come to this attitude, it will enable us at last to break away from the tyranny of applied science and eventually to use it instead of its using us. Then we may realise in full the inestimable gift which it has given us, namely the leisure in which we may really promote happiness in ourselves and others, which is our true goal of progress, by using it for the study and improvement of everything.

CHAPTER XI

VALUES

The Significance of the Immaterial

It has been suggested that mankind may ultimately recognise that the most significant subject for thought is outside the realm of material things and that he may have to formulate his philosophy of life on considerations which are not within the framework of space-time. It must be admitted, of course, that for practical purposes of living, at any rate at our present state of evolution, "things" within the space-time *continuum* are very important and, since they are necessary for our very existence, we must pay a great deal of attention to them. Nevertheless, if we may consider that "things" in the realm of values may be ultimately of greater importance than what we generally call material "things," may we not regard the latter as means to an end rather than as ends in themselves? Is there any reason to suppose that man cannot eventually direct his attention away from material progress to spiritual progress? Archbishop Temple summed this up in his definition of Process:

"(1) Process is real and whatever has no relevance to the actual world process is fictitious.

(2) Mind arises in the course of the world process and is one of its episodes.

(3) But it is an episode of which the distinguishing feature is its capacity, by means of 'free ideas,' to survey the process of which initially it is a part.

(4) In that survey it apprehends process as an organic unity, such that not only does the past condition the present, but the future qualifies and sometimes even occasions both past and present alike.

(5) It thus achieves a certain superiority to and independence of the process—not indeed such as to endow it with a life wholly detached from the process, but such that the process falls within its grasp, not it within that of the process.

(6) In respect of values, past events, as apprehended in the present, are not unalterable, but may still be so affected by the events won or wrought out of them as to become even the opposite of what, at the time of their occurrence, they were and, when viewed in their isolation, still are."¹

Man may indeed eventually be truly spiritual in his outlook.

Before we go further with this, however, we must again remember the necessity for humble agnosticism. We have seen that in the short period of 5,000 years, during which the history of mankind has been

¹ W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 212.

recorded, his progress in the material realm has been colossal and has been of the very first importance. What may happen to him in the many millennia which are still before him, even on the most pessimistic computation of the world's duration as a habitable planet, we do not know. It may be that a time will come when man will have reached the limit of progress by material means, and will no longer require any further aids to his spiritual progress, although he does not seem to be able to get on very far now without them. We cannot tell and we cannot envisage such a situation at all, but that does not mean that it is any more impossible than would aeroplanes and wireless have seemed to the early Sumerian. It has already been suggested that man's increasing mastery over the realm of matter may even stop or reverse the process of entropy, or he might be able to discard matter altogether.

Although he is so taken up with his material betterment, it is common experience that man does think in terms of values even now and has done so for at least two thousand years, if not longer, though this may only represent a small proportion of his total thought process. He has reached out with longing for something higher than himself; he has seen the "star in the East" often behind a cloud, but always there. The feeling that this life is not everything that matters and that success in this life is not all-important has long been man's belief, especially the belief of the poets and prophets.¹ As Julian Huxley² has pointed out, this seeking after something higher is actually inherent in us and manifests itself, just in so far as man has developed the emotion of reverence. Lord Herbert of Cherbury in the very early seventeenth century asserted that religion is the chief distinguishing mark of man as a species and that there are no real atheists but only so-called atheists, who object to the false and inappropriate attributes which are assigned to Diety, and will rather have no God than one who is unworthy of belief. In other words, he has a very real appreciation of values, which was perhaps even better developed than it is now, before the industrial revolution roused such a wave of materialism.

The Significance of Reverence

In the last chapter we saw how the inherent zest of mankind had carried him along to higher things, especially in the material sphere. May not reverence, also inherent, added to zest carry us on to something higher still in the sphere of values?

¹ cf.

"The morning of manhood has risen,
The shadowless soul is in sight,
The tree many rooted
That swells to the sky
With frondage red fringed
The life tree am I.
In the sap of my leaves
Ye shall live and not die."

A. C. Swinburne: *Hertha*.

² J. Huxley: *Religion without Revelation*.

In earliest times, reverence was certainly born of fear and Buckle¹ would have us believe only of fear, fear mainly of the cataclysms of nature in tropical regions. It was directed towards supposedly outside forces, which could benefit or harm weak and unprotected man. Then, as man with his tool-making began to prove himself the lord of his destiny value was set upon his own desires, the products or the objects of his own instinctive impulses. His gods became spirits closely related to himself and his own wish-fulfilments, which could promote or retard the achievement of the goal which he set before him. We cannot, however, agree with Buckle that reverence is only rooted in the emotions of fear and greed and the distorted imagination born of these feelings, for all through history the spiritual leaders of mankind have been aware of something else, something less selfish, something more worth while.

The Long View

In the age of the great Greek culture, the dramatists dealt with the domination of man by his passions and the consequences of their interaction, personifying them sometimes as very human and very venial gods, but the great philosophers, especially the idealist school of Socrates and Plato, pointed to values above and beyond these, values to which man could and indeed ought to strive, the abstractions of Truth, Beauty and Goodness. Moreover, they envisaged values beyond the advantage of the immediate moment and credited man with an insight into things beyond the present and the obvious.

Shakespeare deals with this when the Trojans discuss whether Helen was worth keeping, in view of the misery and slaughter she was causing, and takes the matter a step further. He makes Priam's sons see beyond this immediate misery and they talk of honour and courage and their obligations to their brother Paris, which after all were personal satisfactions, but Hector, whose honour and courage are beyond suspicion, especially as he has just issued his challenge to single combat with any Greek, goes even further and gets more to grips with the real value of the situation and sees the situation from a wider, less personal angle. He says:

"Brother, she is not worth what she doth cost the holding." And Troilus replies:

"What's ought but as 'tis valued?"

but Hector:

"But value dwells not in particular will,
It holds his estimate and dignity
As well wherein 'tis precious of itself
As in the prizer; 'tis mad idolatry

To make the service greater than the God
And the will deter, that is attributive

¹ H. T. Buckle: *History of Civilisation in England*.

To what infectiously itself affects
Without some image of the affected merit."¹

We must learn to look beyond our individual selves and our particular tastes and opinions and beyond the immediate advantage; to have in fact faith in the ultimate quality of the situation in relation to duty.

"To suffer woes which hope thinks infinite,
To forgive wrongs darker than death or night,
To defy power which seems omnipotent,
To love and bear to hope till hope creates
From its own wreck the thing it contemplates.
Neither to change, to falter nor repent,
This like thy glory, Titan is to be,
Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free,
This is alone life, joy, empire and victory."²

This quality of deity is what we must reverence and reverence can be felt, not only for something feared and repellent, but also for something loved and admired. It is a positive not a negative reverence which will lead us forward.³

As McDougall has pointed out, these more complex emotions such as awe and reverence, of which in their full form only man is capable, do involve this looking beyond immediate temporal advantages. Some will say that animals show by their behaviour that they are capable of awe and reverence, but while we cannot say for certain what a dog feels when he looks up at his master "with his eyes full of worship," the emotion is undoubtedly felt in relation to a situation here and now and it does not seem possible in the dog, as is the case in man, for this emotion to become a habit of mind, which may accompany and enrich a true philosophy of life, by looking to a future beyond man's immediate vision.

Reverence from Fear

To progress we must practise reverence and develop our capacity for it. Let us consider from what this feeling of awe and reverence is created; first, suggestibility and the acceptance of suggestion along with curiosity, for we cannot feel awe or reverence for a thing or a person, unless we are drawn towards it, unless we are curious about it. There

¹ W. Shakespeare: *Troilus and Cressida*, II, ii.

² P. B. Shelley: *Prometheus*.

³ cf. R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, IV, 1408-14.

"Our happiest earthly comradeships held a foretaste of the feast of salvation and by that virtue in them provoke desire beyond them to out-reach and surmount their humanity in some superhumanity and ultimate perfection: which, howe'er 'tis found or strangely imagin'd, answereth to the need of each and pulleth him instinctively as to a final cause."

must be a desire for knowledge about it and an acceptance of what it has to teach us, if we are going to receive its messages, whether these be fearful or beneficent. For awe, however, we want something more, because awe means a component of fear of something mysterious, something which we don't understand. This fear may be very considerably modified, as when we say we are frightened by the degree of our love or the extent of our happiness. If there is to be reverence as well as awe then we must regard this mysterious something as higher or greater or stronger than ourselves, something before which we are prepared to abase ourselves and this may apply equally to a being we fear as to a being we love.

Reverence and Love

But this reverence will only be of real service if it is felt for something we love; something which is to our spiritual rather than to our material advantage. There is a world of difference between the reverence which some men will feel for a successful business man and the reverence felt for transcendental beauty or unrestricted goodness. The Stoic philosophy declares that:

"We are part of an order, a cosmos which we see to be infinitely above our comprehension, but which we know to be an expression of love for man; what can we do but accept it, not with resignation but with enthusiasm, and offer to it with pride any sacrifice which it may demand of us. It is a glory to suffer for such an end. . . . Accept the cosmos, will joyously that which Gods wills and make the eternal powers your own."¹

But can we not combine this philosophy with that of the Epicureans who taught that the end of the universe was that man should be happy?

All the component factors, which go to make up the complex emotion of reverence, are of course present in us all, for they are primal instinctive reactions, with which we are all provided at birth; but their building up is a later development, which is more successful, and the resultant emotion is better organized and stronger in expression in some than in others. McDougall has shown us how these compound emotions are built up and how, with the higher evolution of mind, we are capable of strong enduring feelings, which the animals scarcely enjoy. To quote Professor Huxley:

"The normal man has an innate capacity for experiencing a feeling of sanctity in certain events, just as (on a lower and more determinate plane) he has for experiencing red and blue, fear and disgust and desire, or as he has for experiencing beauty or the validity of logical proof or for feeling love or hate or judging good and evil. Some have this in an overmastering-degree and will be haunted all their days by the experiences of holiness and the felt need of conforming their life to them. The majority, on the other hand, have it much less

¹ Gilbert Murray: *Five Stages of Greek Religion. The Great Schools.*

intensely. They will in their degree understand holiness when it is pointed out to them, but be incapable of the pioneering discoveries or the power of expression of the exceptional few. These few are like the creators in the world of poetry and music, the rest are like those who can and do respond to the creation of the poets and the musicians and value it, while themselves remaining dumb. Finally, there are undoubtedly some, who either congenitally or through their upbringing, are wholly unable to appreciate what is meant by the sacred or the holy, just as there are a few men born with a defect of the retina, leading to colour blindness, a few who are born imbecile, unable to follow a logical chain of reasoning, a few born moral imbeciles, incapable of appreciating what is meant by right or wrong, and many more in whom upbringing or their own mode of life has deadened or wholly distorted their moral sense."¹

Spinoza sums up the matter:

"For the things that commonly happen in life and are esteemed among men as the highest good (as is witnessed by their works) can be reduced to these three, Riches, Fame and Lust; and by these the mind is so distracted, that it can scarcely think of any other good. . . . But love directed towards the external and infinite, feeds the mind with pure joy and is free from all sadness."²

Again to quote Huxley:

"Not only does the normal man have this capacity for experiencing the sense of the sacred, but he demands its satisfaction. This may come through the services of an organised church:"

even of the bricks and mortar of a church building:

"as was exemplified by the Austrian peasants, who in many places insisted on building new churches in place of those that official Bolshevism had destroyed or turned to other uses; or it may find satisfaction through a religiously felt morality, the necessity of which to some minds has been so finely put in *Romola*, by George Eliot, that I cannot forbear from quoting, 'the highest sort of happiness often brings so much pain with it, that we can only tell it from pain by its being what we would choose before everything else, because our souls see it is good.'"³

We must then allow that this capacity for reverence exists in almost all human beings and is natural to mankind, for Huxley implies, and rightly implies, that those who are born without it are born abnormal and wanting, just as the imbecile is born abnormal and wanting. In the childhood of the race, as has been said, this reverence was partly founded on fear, but as the race grows up, the fear is more and more replaced by love, both in the genesis and the expression of the emotion. We have not ousted fear yet by any means and we are not capable of love on the highest plane, for "we need'st must love the highest when we see it"

¹ J. Huxley: *Religion without Revelation*.

² Spinoza: *De Intellectus Emendatione*.

³ J. Huxley: *Religion without Revelation*.

is alas for most people no more than an aspiration, rather than a statement of fact. Nevertheless it is true that:

"The wealth of a man is the number of things he loves and blesses, which he is loved and blessed by."¹

So in order to raise the emotion of reverence to its highest levels, to ensure this recognition of an affinity with something better than ourselves, this striving towards the holy, we must eventually entirely replace fear by love. Just as our present experience of sexual love is an advance upon the lust of the unmodified mating instinct as displayed in the casual encounters of animals, so is the true and highest religious impulse an advance on the reverence of the savage for his gods.

"Love will teach us all things, but we must learn how to win love; it is got with difficulty . . . when once thou perceive this, thou wilt perceive the mystery of God in all, and thou wilt thereforward grow every day to a fuller understanding of it, until at last thou come to love the whole world with a love that will then be all embracing and universal."²

Love must replace Fear

This, after all, was the message of the New Testament. Jehovah of the Old Testament was the God to be feared, but the father which art in heaven of the New Testament is the God to be loved. Freud's insistence on the "fear of the father" as an influence, which so greatly affects life, may well be a regression, although in many respects the teaching of Freud has done much to further our understanding of humanity and its reaction to life. In this Freudian conception of a family tradition of fear and its consequences, we are again back at the old Jewish conception of the hard, tyrannical father, the tribal chief, who is to be feared by all the younger generation and against whom rebellion is inevitable, if not a positive duty. But Freud was a Jew with all the Jewish conservatism of belief, and may not Western civilization at its best already have passed beyond this? Has not our selective breeding or our social heritage raised us even now to a conception of the father as a loving, wise counsellor and friend, who, far from hindering us and obstructing us, will do all he can to help us. Admittedly it is not always so and the tyrannical father like Mr. Barrett of Wimpole Street is still to be found, but he is rarer than he was and the love of the father is now more the rule than the exception. If this is true then it marks a great advance.

As Freud has shown, the awe, the fear felt for the father is a great source of conflict in the mind, a cause of great unhappiness and maybe worse. If fathers and sons, and mothers and daughters can advance away from the Oedipus and the Electra in family life, then there will

¹ T. Carlyle: *Past and Present*, IV, v.

² A. Dostoievsky: *The Brothers Karamazov*.

have been a real progress towards the really valuable things in life, towards Happiness, Harmony, Truth, Beauty and Goodness.

It is its insistence on love which constitutes the great appeal of the Christian religion and makes us feel that its fundamental tenets represent the highest values we have yet attained in the march of religious experience and it is only because much of the loving reverence for happiness in its truest sense, which Christ originally taught, has been overlaid again by the fear and hate and cruelty of man's stupidity, that we call for a new revelation and a new start. In any such new revelation, we must learn truly to love the spiritual and not the material, the value of the "thing" not the "thing in itself."

Reverence from Fear

What we would like to believe is that man has now reached a stage in the evolution of his mind, in his capacity to grasp Truth, Beauty and Goodness, which may allow the revelation to come from within rather than from without. This, surely, as Gilbert Burnet says, is the true religion:

"By religion I mean such a sense of divine truth, as enters into a man and becomes a spring of new nature within him, reforming his thoughts and designs, purifying his heart and sanctifying him and governing his whole deportment, his words as well as his actions; convincing him that it is not enough, not to be scandalously vicious or to be innocent in his conversation; but that he must be entirely, uniformly and consistently pure and virtuous, animating with a zeal to be still better and better, more eminently good and exemplary."¹

In the old religions it was necessary for a prophet to act as intermediary between the "supernatural" being and mankind, and to bring a message to the people. Further he had, by the force of his personality, to compel them to accept his teaching. In the olden days this teaching was imposed upon them by fear and threats and their reverence for the Deity who was presented to them was the reverence of fear. "The Lord thy God is a jealous God, who will visit the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." Hence the people were taught "Ye must love the Lord thy God, lest worse things befall you." The inducements to love, like the laws of living, had to be applied by sanctions, by threats of punishments and the promise of personal rewards, if not in this life, then in the next.

The Meaning of Evil

Man, however, is not always prepared to accept the laws which seem to govern his life with uncritical submission when they are forced upon him from without; eventually he must face them and try to put them right by his own efforts. In the Book of Job we find this issue faced squarely for the first time in a critical spirit trying to find out the real

¹ Gilbert Burnet: *An Address to Posterity*.

meaning and truth of things, though the conclusions may well be regarded as unsatisfactory, since Job can only discard the facile explanation without reaching any satisfying conclusion.

Job puts the old, old question, "Why do the wicked prosper, wax fat and kick? Why do misfortunes fall upon the innocent and upon those who have done their best to be upright?" His friends are still at the stage at which they blindly accept the doctrine of reward and punishment as the only explanation and say: "Because you have been a sinner and have deserved these misfortunes." But Job knows better, he knows quite well that he has not deserved them and the answer which he gets from Jehovah presumably speaking through his own mind is: "Because I am the Lord; because My ways are not thy ways, because thou canst not understand the Divine purpose; because ultimate reality is a mystery, which may be sought and loved, but will also be fearful until it is fully understood." So Job admits that the doctrine of just rewards and punishments is not satisfying because things did not work out that way; but he does not get any further and the answer he got may or may not have satisfied him, according to the extent to which he was capable of humble agnosticism.

Man's Urge to Find Himself

This submission to a mystery is not enough for man when he is grown up. He is coming to realize that it is his own task to find out, perhaps even to construct or at least to modify, the ways of the Lord, to find out the rules of the universe, the rules that lead to Harmony and Happiness and to conform to them.

"In the 73rd Psalm the religious man's difficulty in face of the prosperity of the wicked is posited. He had been perplexed that the ungodly should prosper and almost thought of throwing in his lot with them. But now he knows that, however great their possessions, they are truly destitute, while the man who has found fellowship with God is rich, though he possess nothing. That is the real solution, not an answer to the riddle, but the attainment of a state of mind in which there is no desire to ask it."¹

In other words, man must find out for himself what are the real values, indeed, he may have to create them. As we shall see, in the long distance of the future, he himself must become the Lord. It is his task to find out all about the Divine purpose, that purpose which he must reverence, that is the road to happiness to which he pins his faith; to solve the mystery of ultimate reality, to cast out fear, for "Perfect love casteth out fear" and the ultimate reality is perfect love. Then rewards and punishments both of himself and others will be in his own hands and if he has reached the stage of complete and full love, he will not fear punishments, because punishments will not be necessary nor will he need special rewards.

This is what Jesus tried to teach, but the world was not ready for it

¹ W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 43.

and he was despised and rejected of men. When man is ready for this message, he will not need an intervening prophet, because man's mind will have reached to God and the revelation will come from himself.

Professor Huxley has set forth the framework of a wider religion in terms that are worth quoting:

"A developed religion must satisfy the following requirements. It will not merely be confined to man's more or less immediate reaction to the mysterious or sacred, it will not be content with a system (often incomplete and self-contradictory) of mythology or of primitive rationalization as its theology; nor only with traditional ritual or formalism as its code of action. On the contrary, it will always extend its conception of what is sacred and a proper object of religious feeling to include man's destiny and his relation with the rest of the world; it will apply the pure force of intellect to its ideas and attempt a theology or intellectual basis, which shall be both logical and comprehensive, accurate and coherent; it will also inevitably perceive that ethics and morality are keystones of human destiny, and link up its sacred beliefs with a pure ethic and reasoned morality. It will, in a word, not be content to leave its religious life chaotic and unordered, with loose ends unconnected with the rest of reality, but will come more and more consciously to aim at an organised and unified scheme of religion, which further shall be connected with all other parts of the mental life: and it will attempt to achieve this by putting forward a scheme of belief and a scale of values, around and over which man's aspirations to sacredness in emotions, thought and action may most securely grow.

Thus a developed religion should definitely be a relation of the personality as a whole to the rest of the universe, one into which reverence enters and one in which the search for the ultimate satisfactions of discovering and knowing truth, experiencing and expressing beauty and ensuring the good in righteous action, all have the freest possible play.

Any conflict which prevents the personality from attaining wholeness is a hindrance; all taboos against considering any part of the universe in relation to man and his destiny are hindrances; so, too, are all restrictions upon the free use of reason or the free appeal to conscience. An undeveloped religion does impede human faculty and developed religion is one which is so organised that it helps to unify the diverse human faculties and to give each of them the fullest play in a common task."¹

This brings us very near to the position taken up in this argument and if the man is really progressing, as is here maintained, towards Truth, Beauty and Goodness, there does seem no reason why this developed religion should not be worked out by man for himself, on the basis of:

"The holistic organic field of nature exercises a subtle moulding, controlling influence in respect of the general trend of organic

¹ J. Huxley: *Religion without Revelation*.

advance. That trend is not random or accidental or free to move in all directions, it is controlled, it has the general character of uniform direction under the influence of the organic or holistic field of nature."¹

Man must make his own Religion

When he achieves this, he will achieve automatic obedience to the great commandment, Love thy God, for he will love the quality which is Deity, since that will be the basis of his religion. But to do this he must develop a great capacity for reverence and must reverence nothing less than Deity. Deity is something to be created and in the highest sense to be served and loved.² For it is through love that this advance will be made, the sentiment of real love organizes all the dynamic forces of the personality towards something higher, something better than ourselves, something for which we can feel true reverence and pursue with unremitting zest. Gregariousness, with its sublimation into mutual help, as Kropotkin has shown us, helps, but it cannot do without the drive of love, based on sex, if you like, "breed," as Bridges has, perhaps, better called it. For sex attraction is the origin of sexual love, together with parental feeling, which is so closely associated with it, is the basis of universal love. When we are truly in love with our chosen mate then above all we feel that aspiration to sacredness, to perfect honesty and truth, to beauty both appreciated and created and to that close and harmonious adjustment to life which makes for goodness.

When this love can spread from the single object to the many, it absorbs and is intensified by the impulse to mutual help described by Kropotkin. It will then develop with that social conscience, whose very considerable development, even in our time, has already been discussed, until our love embraces the whole universe.

It should be noted that at this level we shall no longer be concerned with the "thing" itself but with the value which it has. We shall no longer reverence or love a God or a person or a thing, but rather what the God, the person or the thing represents, its value in the scheme of things and we shall realize that this value is far more important than the thing itself. At this highest level of development, we shall transfer significance from the particular to the general. We shall no longer have to worry about the honest man or our honesty to men, about the beautiful

¹ J. Smuts: *Holism and Evolution*, p. 339.

² cf. R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, IV, 1369-77.

"FRIENDSHIP is in loving rather than in being lov'd,
which is its mutual benediction and recompense;
and tho' this be, and tho' love is from lovers learn'd,
it springeth none the less from the old essence of self.
No friendless man ('twas well said) can be truly himself;
what a man looketh for in his friend and findeth,
and loving self best, loveth better than himself,
is his own better self, his live lovable idea,
flowering by expansion in the loves of his life."

thing, be it sound or sight or any other perception through our senses, about the good man or our goodness to men, but will only be concerned with Truth, Beauty and Goodness for their own sakes, for their own values. Then indeed we shall love God and when we love God in all perfection, we shall see that it is only the value of things that matters and every thing and every one will be true, every thing and every one will be beautiful and every thing and every one will be good, for it will not be only the one or two or the chosen few, who will have reached this perfection, but every one will have reached the supreme value of Deity.

THE QUALITY OF DEITY

Conceptions of God

If our impulses of zest and reverence are to lead up to the love of God, what is the God that we are to love? The quality of Deity has already been referred to, but it may clarify the conception if we deal shortly with its evolution. Let us consider the gods of man.

The Pagan God

First is the god of fear, or rather the gods of fear, for primitive man saw gods in everything, in heat and cold, in the sun and the moon and the stars, in the earth and the sea, in the rivers and the woods. For the most part these gods were hostile, they attacked and oppressed man, they had to be placated and propitiated, but if they were sufficiently pleased by the sacrifices offered, they might be good to man and even help him in his life struggle. But man turned the tables and by his evolving genius began to tame these gods, to employ them for his own uses and bend them to his will. Still he could not dismiss his fears, for his control was all too slight and all too uncertain. Since the majority of men were occupied in the hard struggle for existence, it became necessary to leave to a certain class—the priests—the task of placating the gods. These priests were not slow to realize the power this gave them, and the selfish and aggressive instincts for the most part swamped the instincts of mutual aid. So the priest class took care to keep the people's fears alive and formed themselves into a class apart. Within that class there arose a hierarchy of ranks according to the aggressive force of the individual member. With, or because of, this division of rank amongst the priests, there arose a hierarchy of gods with chief gods and lesser gods, to whom was owed greater or less respect and service. The sun god and the goddess of generation tended to be the prototypes of the heads of this hierarchy. The first of these personifications were Isis and Osiris, with corresponding deities in all religions.

The Jewish God

Next came the single God, the Jewish God, who was supposed to favour the Chosen People in return for unquestioning obedience. If man would acknowledge one God as the chief God, or better still, the only God, then that God, Jehovah, would look after those that served him. This again strengthened the priesthood, for by this time nations and their secular leaders, the kings, who might or might not be priests, had

appeared, and kings as well as priests sought power over the minds, as well as the bodies, of their people. They welcomed the opportunity to turn the credulity of the people to their own advantage. The kings often tried to play the priests of one god against those of another and, maintaining the balance of power, were able to divide and rule. But once there was a single God, if the priests of Jehovah could finally overcome the priests of Baal, then since the God Jehovah was the one God, the supreme God, the former seized the power and alone were able to propitiate and to some extent control this God, whose power was greater than that of any king. Now this single God was not universally hostile to those that serve Him. He would grant them favours, if they would behave themselves according to His will. But His people still had to propitiate Him by gifts and sacrifices, gifts which very often turned out to be greatly to the advantage of the priests.

Still all the laws imposed upon the people were not oppressive, many very much the reverse, for in spite of the general selfishness of priests and kings, the principle of mutual aid was there and neither priest nor king could long survive the collective hostility of the people. Although self-seeking and greed were very strong and in any contest seemed sure to win, consideration for the general good did have room to grow and we see in the laws of Moses, and in those of other really great leaders, social and moral rules which were definitely beneficial to the community as a whole. Thou shalt not murder, commit adultery, steal or covet are all good rules and many of the hygienic instructions contained in the Pentateuch could not be bettered to-day and the people themselves were definitely encouraged to help each other.

Beauty, too, both in art and life, was beginning to become manifest in the service of the gods. The works of art from the Greek temples to the Gothic cathedrals, and all that served to adorn them, were worthy tributes to man's reverence for his gods. The wise men and the prophets were proclaiming wisdom and goodness and there is no doubt that their teaching had practical effect. Still the heroes of the pagan world and the Saviour who, in the Old Testament prophecies, was to rescue the Chosen People from their misfortunes, were material saviours, who were to restore them to a better world, but a better world of possessions and power. At least that is how the people as a whole understood the role of their gods and the prophecies relating to the Messiah.

All this time and especially, as we have seen, during the sixth century B.C., the human mind was growing and man was emerging from the narrow, selfish, grinding struggle for existence, and Truth, Beauty and Goodness were constellations rising above the horizon of man's consciousness, mostly in connection with religion and the worship of the gods.

So far, although God was imperious, unseen and unpredictable, he was essentially a person, different from man perhaps, but still of the same general characteristics, having an individuality and temperament like man. His representation was always in the likeness of a man with a

body and a beard—the Father, the ruler capable of consideration, justice and even kindness, but often, all too often, exhibiting wrath, vengeance and cruelty. Such were Zeus, Jove and Jehovah.

The God of Love

Then came the great religious revolution, the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, who preached not the problematic love of God for His children if they behaved themselves, but the God of love. There were two great new principles in this teaching; one that was at least partially understood and accepted and the other only very dimly realized, even at the present day. The first was that love was the guiding principle of the Universe, not fear, cruelty and power, and the second was that God must not be thought of as a loving person but as Love. God does not love, He is Love. This last proposition was too much for man to grasp in his then state of mental advancement, and was certainly not made consistently clear in the teaching of Jesus himself. The narrative of the first three Gospels is content to describe the life and conversations of Jesus and makes little attempt to express this principle and we remain with the anthropomorphic picture of the Father which art in Heaven. A loving Father indeed, not the cruel and vindictive Father of the Jews, but a person, a superman perhaps, but still a man. In the Neo-Platonic fourth Gospel, we see a greater effort to envisage a spiritual, impersonal Being, but even in this work the references to such are neither clear nor consistent and it is not very surprising that even the Disciples and still more the common people were unable to grasp this difficult principle and were mystified by much of the teaching of the Master, as recorded by St. John. It is very doubtful if the recipients of the First Epistle of St. John really understood his full meaning when he wrote:

“Let us love one another, for love belongs to God, and everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. He who does not love, does not know God, for God is love.”¹

At least the behaviour of men who came after them gave no indication of such understanding, which was still only too obviously imperfect.

“Mind as it occurs as an episode in the world process takes the form of finite minds. It is indeed confined within extremely narrow limitations. It cannot attain to any grasp of the true proportions and perspective of the world in which it is set. Certain things have a value for it and are its apparent good. There is no absolute necessity for this to be other than the real good; yet the probability of divergence is so great as to amount to certainty for all practical purposes.”²

Jesus had to talk in parables, or his audience would not have understood him at all, but often these parables only made confusion worse confounded and well might St. Paul say, now we see as through a glass darkly, and hope that the time might come when we would see face to

¹ First Epistle of St. John v, 7 (Moffatt translation).

² W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 365.

face. Even now, the Christian teaching is still of a personal intervening God and perhaps is rightly so, for the majority of mankind would not understand anything else. But this symbolic presentation still presents difficulties two thousand years later, perhaps even greater than ever.

The Church's God

Can the Church's presentation of a personal God fully represent the quality of Love? Let us consider how far the Christian religion succeeds in this. The fixation of man's attention on the principle of love was the truly significant advance, which Christianity achieved; but as taught by the Church to-day, is this love complete? What are the loves of man? Love of the father, love of the mother, love of the sister, love of the brother, but also, most important of all, love of the wife and love of the child and then, arising from all these, dependent on all these, but transcending all these, love of Humanity and Love of God. How has Christianity symbolized and dealt with all these loves?

Parental Love

The principle from which Christianity developed, derived as it was from the Jewish faith, was love of the Father. Indeed the father image was the chief God, the head of the hierarchy in all or almost all primitive religions. The main difference between the teaching of Christ and that of the Jews was that while fatherhood was the first attribute of God, this new father was a loving father, a considerate father, a helpful father. But some religions, with which Christianity soon came into contact, were centred round not only a dominant father, but also a mother, who might fill as dominant a role as that of the father. This mother goddess represented the life-giving earth out of which came all things new, all the fresh life, which man needed for his existence.

This dual worship of mother and father—of Isis and Osiris—was the religion of the Egyptians who influenced early Christianity to such an extent. Some cults went even further and placed the mother image above that of the father. In view of all that man obtained from the earth, it is no wonder that some primitive men worshipped the great mother and only came to recognize the father role later, and then only as incidental and relatively unimportant. According to some philosophers, such as Jung, this mother image still influences man profoundly in his unconscious life. The Catholic Church has adopted and incorporated this mother worship to a very large extent in the deification of the Virgin Mary and so we may say that parental love both that of the father and the mother are represented in Christian teaching. But always that love was personalized, and the Son of Man was the personalized symbol of that love and the intermediary through which this love was conveyed to man. Still this was a very great advance, for it meant a widening of the conception of love beyond the father or the mother to the family as a whole and beyond the family to the whole human race. "Suffer little

children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," did not only apply to the children themselves, but to the weak and the poor and the humble amongst mankind. It must be remembered, too, that even the strongest of mankind were held to be weak and taught to be humble in the sight of God.

This teaching, to be kind to the weak, was something quite new in human ethics and no doubt explained why Christianity spread so fast amongst what were then the lower classes of society, who in these times constituted an even larger proportion of the population than they do to-day, and were even more miserable, oppressed and inarticulate. The opposition of the upper classes to Christianity lasted a long time, the best part of three hundred years, but at last the weight of the inarticulate masses and of the opposition parties, who courted their support, made itself felt, and Constantine, fighting against the inevitable decline and fall of Rome, found it good policy to make Christianity the official religion of the Empire. But this early history of the Christian religion, which inevitably resulted in its establishment as the faith of the humble and meek, has coloured it ever since and has given rise to the criticism that it is altogether too humble and meek and therefore cannot have any appeal for the more robust spirits. This, however, is not a very valid criticism, as many Christian apologists have pointed out, and may be more an expression of rebellion of the more robust spirits of the world against the rigid discipline imposed by the priests than against the religion itself.

Brotherly Love

Jesus preached the love of brotherhood and the brotherhood of love. The twelve disciples were the first example of a true brotherhood. The love of the brother was known and revered long before the time of Christ and the story of David and Jonathan was one of the most beautiful and most admired of the old tradition. But Jesus was the brother not of a man, but of man and this conception of universal brotherhood was something definitely new, since the continual struggle for power, if not for existence, between small communities was not likely to foster the idea. Jesus could be brother to the strong and brother to the weak, brother to the righteous and brother to the wicked, brother to the man and brother to the woman, whether the woman be Martha or Mary, or even the Magdalene and all these should be brethren to each other through him. But this universal brotherhood was not so easy to grasp or to put into operation for most people of that age. Although Rome had enormously extended the rights of citizenship, which carried common privileges and common obligations and while this citizenship did aim, in theory at least, at some degree of universal brotherhood, in practice the rights were never extended to barbarians and slaves and in any case the rich and powerful showed no signs of taking their obligations of brotherhood very seriously. Mankind had not yet learnt to say to all men:

"And therefore sit you down in gentleness
And take upon command what help we have
That to your wanting may be minister'd."¹

The picture of the father and of the brother are then sufficiently definite and clear-cut in the Christian teaching and the love of mother has been adopted and incorporated by the Catholic Church. But, perhaps because it was incorporated and was not an original doctrine, it was refused recognition to a large extent by the stricter Protestant sects.

The love of sister, however, is not by any means so clear, except in so far as she shares in the universal brotherhood. The monastic and conventual foundations were brotherhoods and sisterhoods but the sexes were definitely segregated. Perhaps the woman who broke the pot of precious ointment and bathed the Saviour's feet with her tears comes as near to it as anything, but there is no personality in the Christian hierarchy who really represents sisterly love. Some of the female saints, especially those who were missionaries, who have been canonized by the Catholic Church, have been brought in to fill this gap and do represent this side of love, but since these saints are not universally recognized as divine, this is an omission in the doctrine of love.

Married Love

But the greatest lacuna in the Christian conception of Deity is the lack of representation of the love of wife. Although the Preacher recognized the importance of married love:

"In three things I was beautified;
And stood up beautiful before God and men;
The unity of brethren, the love of neighbours,
A man and a wife that agree together"²

As has been repeatedly said here and has been sung by the poets of all ages, the sublimation of the lust of mating into the love of wedded partners, whether sanctified by Holy Church or not, is the most ennobling experience of man and yet it is not only left out of the Christian conception of love, but it would sometimes appear to be definitely excluded. The impression left on the mind of the critical witness of Christian teaching is that the nobility of the love of a wedded pair is developed rather in spite of, than because of, their physical union. That sexual love at the time of the birth of Christianity was too often nothing but lecherous lust was probably true, but that did not mean that the inspiration of love even at that time could not raise the human mind to higher things. This is shown not only by a great deal of Greek poetry, but also by Hebrew poetry such as the Song of Songs. It is sometimes said that the belief that the end of the world would come within the lifetime of the generation in which Christ lived made sexual love unnecessary, but there seemed to be more than this in the general early Christian attitude

¹ W. Shakespeare: *As You Like It*, II, vii.

² Ecclesiasticus xxiv.

and the usual, though probably erroneous, interpretation of St. Paul's famous text "It is better to marry than to burn" has influenced Christian teaching from that day to this.

Taking it all in all, it does seem a major misfortune that married love did not figure more in the Christian doctrine and on the whole the raising of celibacy to the status of a major virtue has not been a good thing for the world. It is the usual story of mistaking the means for the end. Doubtless there are professions and walks in life for which the single unencumbered man or woman is more fitted than one who is tied to wife or family, and it may be that the priest and soldier are among this class, but that is no reason for upholding celibacy as a virtue suitable for all. Furthermore, there are unquestionably some people with a natural aptitude for celibacy, often due to an unnatural fear of marriage or unwillingness to give up their freedom, which is another name for selfishness. Such people seem all too fond of trying to impress their own taste and opinions on everyone else. The Protestant Churches have abandoned the principle of celibacy for their priests and indeed it was the notorious abuse, incidental to the so-called celibacy of the Roman Catholic priesthood, which was one of the chief concerns of the reformers and one of the strongest arguments which they used to discredit the Church. We must admit, then, that the love of the married pair is not adequately stressed in the teaching of Christianity, for the love of Christ for his Bride the Church is not a very convincing or compelling doctrine.

The Love of Children for Parents

Again the love of children for their parents is not represented with any conviction or emphasis in the Christian doctrine, probably for the same reason. Of course the child Jesus is represented with the Virgin mother, but the stress is definitely on the love of parent for child, rather than on the love of children for parents. The old motive of honour and respect and implicit obedience was very much in the ascendancy, but there is a great deal more than this in full family affection and no stress is laid in the writings of the early Fathers on the very important role of the parents as companion and first friend.

Community Love

The community love is stressed in the conception of universal brotherhood, as might be expected in a religion appealing so essentially to the oppressed, who have banded themselves together, largely under the banner of the Church, against an authority whose whole purpose was to exploit them. In spite of this, in spite of centuries of Christian teaching, the general conception of mutual aid has only gradually expanded. Even in these days the old bogey of power, selfishness and greed is continually creeping in. How far Christianity itself surpasses other religions in the teaching of altruistic behaviour is a matter for comparative

theologians and sociologists to decide, but that it does so on the whole most unprejudiced observers would agree.

If only all Christians would practise the teaching of St. Paul in one of his most inspired passages:

“Set your heart on the higher talents. And yet I will go on to show you still a higher path. . . . If I have no love, I count for nothing. . . . Love is very patient, very kind. Love knows no jealousy; love makes no parade, gives itself no airs, is never rude, never selfish, never irritated, never resentful, love is never glad when others go wrong, love is gladdened by goodness, always slow to expose, always eager to believe the best, always hopeful, always patient. Love never disappears.”¹

not only would Christianity surpass all other religions, but it would have achieved that quality, which, in this book, we call Deity.

Nevertheless Christianity is still cramped because it clings to Old Testament doctrine and the God whom it claims to demonstrate by its example, as well as by its teaching, is not yet completely a God of Love. The chimera of power encourages the Church to wish to be official, to be the Church of the country. In such a desire it ties itself to government, gaining thereby preferential treatment not only in money and appointments, but also in prestige and authority. The rationalization, of course, is, that by this gain in wealth and position it is enabled to do more good than it could in a humble and disrespected condition. This may be true if the Church is wisely led, but much depends on the personal element and we can all think of plenty of examples of those whose personal pride and greed have taken the advantages either for themselves or for their Church, but have denied or avoided the responsibilities of this privileged position.

The Restraining Effect of Doctrine

In an attempt to establish itself in an unassailable position the Church is liable to enclose itself in a cocoon of rigid doctrine. While this may protect it to a certain degree from internal dissension, the Church may easily find itself in a false position, such as that in which the Catholic Church places itself in relation to the birth of mentally defective children. Doctrine says that births must not be prevented, but the Church is powerless to prevent the irresponsible fertility of the parents of such children and it has to fall back, for what it admits to be an evil, on another doctrine, difficult for many people to accept, that the state of the “soul” in this world is unimportant, but if it is received into grace by the intervention of the Church or, as they would prefer to express it, of God himself through the sacrament of baptism, then all will be well with that soul in the next world. This is not a very convincing argument for the majority of thinking people and this sort of thing has done much to discredit not only the doctrine but the Church itself. It may be because

¹ The First Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. xii, 31 to ch. xiii, 3-8 (Moffatt translation).

it is not convenient for the Catholic priesthood that their flock should think on these and cognate lines in a critical and independent spirit, that there has always been a tendency to keep knowledge and desire for knowledge within the hierarchy of the priesthood and to deny it to the rest. Even now, although this tendency is not so obvious in the more advanced countries, the ignorance of the peasantry in such countries as Southern Ireland and Southern Italy is, or has been until lately, a serious blot on the advance of civilization of the world, and the responsibility of the Catholic priesthood is very great. Such an attitude does not help the advancement towards Truth and, whatever may be the short-term results, not towards Beauty and Goodness either.

God the Spirit

The second great novelty in Christ's teaching was the really serious effort to convey to the people the spirituality of God. This idea, however, was not generally understood or accepted, because the people as a whole were not ready for it, and could still only think in terms of persons and things. The great difficulty about thinking of God as a personification of Truth, Beauty and Goodness is the very obvious existence of evil, pain and suffering. If God is the all-loving father, how can he permit that his children should suffer pain? The answer to which the early theologians were forced was that there was a Devil, an adversary of the good God, who put evil and pain into the world and rejoiced in maintaining them there. But the conception of the Devil by the more advanced theologians was a reversion to the old gods, and the Devil worship, which was such a black offence to the Christian world, was a hark back to the propitiation of the god who would grant favours and protection to those who would submit freely to his will. The story of Dr. Faustus is a translation into relatively modern poetry of the folklore of the ancients.

But if the good God were all-powerful, why did he permit the Devil to work against him and how was it that those who seemed wicked were prosperous, while the righteous were sent empty away? This was surely unjust and a loving God should not be unjust. Here was a serious obstacle to the conceptions of thinking men and many theologians have spent their lives trying to explain it away. So it was necessary to postulate an individual personal survival, so that the good could be rewarded in heaven and the wicked punished in hell and later purgatory was invented, so that the not so bad might have another chance to redeem themselves. But this belief led to worse difficulties still; the body was known to decay. In what form then was this individual personal survival to manifest itself? For most people it was necessary to envisage either a complete duality of body and mind and while the body, the shell, decayed, the mind, still retaining all the attributes of the person, including those which physiology has taught us are given to it by the body, survived to enjoy rewards or submit to punishments, as the case might be. If this

presented insuperable difficulties of belief, the alternative was that there had to be some miraculous gathering together of the body, so that it could clothe the spirit again on the last day, when the individual came for judgment to receive his reward or submit to damnation. As St. Jerome said, "Surely the dead shall rise again with all their flesh and bones, else how can the wicked grind their teeth in hell?"

All these difficulties inherent in the conception of a personal Deity are still exercising the ingenuity of the Churches to explain and no satisfactory explanation has so far been given, nor does it seem likely to be forthcoming, until the idea of a personal God is abandoned. Of late years there has been more and more tendency amongst those who think, to abandon this conception and to accept the idea that God is not anthropomorphic, but is immaterial and therefore to be considered as outside the realm of space and time. In other words, to make a real effort to accept unreservedly the second great principle of Christ's teaching. Professor Julian Huxley has ingeniously dealt with the doctrine of the Trinity from this point of view and his ideas are so appropriate to this argument, that they are worth quoting in full.

"As I see it broadly, God the Father is a personification of the forces of non-human nature, God the Holy Ghost represents abstract ideals and God the Son personifies human nature at its highest, as actually incarnate in bodies and organised in minds, bridging the gulf between the other two, and between each of them and everyday human life. And the unity of the three persons as one God represents the fact that all these aspects of reality are inextricably connected.

The first Person of the Trinity on this view would be the theological name for the outer force and law, which surround man, whether he likes it or not. There may be mind and spirit behind all these powers, but there is none in them. The powers thus symbolised are strange, often seeming definitely alien to man and his desires and even hostile. They go their ways inevitably without regard for human emotions or wishes. They constitute the mysterious *tremendum* of religion. On the other hand they are not always hostile or alien. The spring follows the winter, nature may bring the storm and the flood, but she also blesses with abundance; the powers of nature kill and terrify, but they also bring the sun to shine, the breeze to blow and the birds to sing; they are powers of generation as well as of death.

In general the powers and forces personified as the First Person are those which affect human life not only with their inevitability, but also with their quality of being entirely outside man. They may influence and subdue man or man may influence and control them; they and man's mind may be fused in experience; but in themselves they are not only given but external.

The realities symbolised in the Third Person of the Trinity, however, if my reading of theology is at all correct, are those which are equally given, but which are, from the point of view of humanity,

as a whole internal. From the point of view of the individual man, on the other hand, they have the peculiar quality of being felt as partly internal, imminent, belonging to the self, partly external, transcendent and far greater than the personal self. They are ideas of value and are inevitable to an organism which, like man, has reached the level of conceptual thought.

The role of different ideals within that sphere of reality, which has been personified as the Holy Spirit, has differed enormously in different ages and individuals and sects. It differs according to the scale of values which has been adopted. In general, however, the ideal enshrined in the conception of the Holy Ghost include, in the highest ranks, those of righteousness with special reference to purity and truth, with special reference to the sense of illumination, though they, of course, include many others as well. But it should not be supposed that the reality behind the Third Person of the Trinity consists solely of ideals. It includes also all these 'winds of the spirit' which appear to come from some extra-personal region to fill the sails of the mind. We all know well enough that we may perceive an ideal, understand that it should be followed and yet draw on no interior force which enables us to live by it or through it; and equally that we may be seized and possessed by spiritual forces, which we do not recognise as having previously been part of our personality, uprushing we know not whence, to drive us onward in the service of some ideal. This in some form or another appears to be the almost universal experience of those who, in obedience to their temperament and gifts, have devoted themselves to pure art, pure science, pure philosophy or pure religion; they seem, when most successful in their work, to be least personal. The reality behind all these cases of irruptive spiritual force is constituted by those parts of the unborn capacities of mind and soul, which have not been utilised in the building up of the personality.

The building up of personality consists in adjusting the wholly or partially disconnected instincts and tendencies with which we are born into a connected whole, in which the parts are in organic relation with each other. To this we are forced by experience, by the outer and inner conflicts, which naturally occur, but must be adjusted if we are to live a life worth living and by the light of reason which confronts the actual with the possible and the ideal. This organised mutual relation of mental capacities and tendencies, each adjusted in some measure to the rest and each thus becoming, not merely one in a sum of properties, but an essential part of an organic unity, is what we call the personal self.

The other aspect of this problem to which I have referred consists in the process, in a sense opposite to that we have just been considering, in which the personality, instead of adding to itself, has the sensation of being swallowed up in something larger than personality. This, however, will occur naturally, whenever the pursuit of some ideal comes to dominate strongly over the immediate interests of self.

In any case, in our attempts to translate the terms of Christian theology into our own, we may say that what has been described as

the Holy Spirit is that part of human nature, which impresses by its givenness, by its transcendence of the personal self regarded as a self-centred organization and by its compulsive power of driving human nature on towards an ideal.

Finally there remains the Second Person, the Logos, the Son. In order not to be misrepresented, let me remind my readers at the outset, that orthodox theology, in regard to the Second Person of the Trinity, presents us with a doctrine far from simple, the result of a long process of development. . . . When I speak of the Second Person of the Trinity, therefore, I am not referring to the historical Jesus, nor to the idea of Jesus, which was present to the minds of the Twelve Apostles or the early Church, but to this complex idea as presented in the Nicene Creed and subsequent theology, deriving from Jewish and Pagan religious sources, from Greek philosophy and from Patristic theology as well as from the man Jesus, the facts of his life and death and the legends associated with him. And this I make bold to say embodies the fundamental reality, that only through human nature, through personalities with all their limitations, is the infinite of the ideal made finite and actual, is the potential, which we have recognised behind the term Holy Spirit realized in the world, is the apparently complete discontinuity between matter and spirit bridged over. Modern science is able in one not unimportant particular to amplify the original doctrine. Through our knowledge of evolutionary biology, we can see that human nature is not, as a matter of fact, alone in this; but that human nature merely does more efficiently, more completely consciously and on a definitely higher plane, what other life has been doing gropingly, unconsciously and partially for æons before ever man was. We can, therefore, say that the nature which finds its highest expression in human nature, constitutes this bridge. Since, however, it is, so far as we know, human nature alone which mediates fully, or indeed, at all, in certain domains between ideal and actual, between spiritual and material, it is human nature alone which need be considered fully, although the evolutionary background lends a richness and a solidity of foundation to all the conceptions involved.

This same conception, of human nature being in its highest aspects divine, is found in many places. . . . Orthodox theology, naturally moving within the bounds of the theistic conception, prefers to interpret these facts by saying that God was incarnated in human nature in the person of Jesus; and when both liberal and logical, by admitting that God is partially incarnated in all human beings; I prefer to say that the spiritual elements, which are usually styled divine, are part and parcel of human nature. Thus the reality personified as the Second Person of the Trinity becomes to our reinterpretation, we must ask what is the reality which is symbolized by the union of the three Persons in one God? It is in this aspect of theology, that I think the facts of science may be seen to have the greatest value. . . . Science gives assurance of unity, uniformity and continuity. . . . Utilizing these assurances as part of our background, we can then proceed to envisage the relation between the three

aspects of the Trinity somewhat as follows. The First Person represents the power and externality of matter and material law, given and inexplicable. The Third Person represents the illumination and compulsive power of thought, feeling, will—the faculties of mind in its highest ranges and at the level when it deals with universals; these also are inexplicable, but must be accepted as given. The Second Person is the link between the other two; it is life in concrete actuality mediating between ideal and practice, incarnating (in perfectly literal phrase) more and more of spirit in matter. This progressive incarnation may be unconscious, as appears to be the case with organic evolution; or conscious, as in the deliberate attempt by man to realise his visions.”¹

The Conception of Deity

This approach, like the other ideas of Huxley already quoted, comes very near to that which is presented in this book. This involves the conception of the complete depersonalization of Deity and, as Alexander has suggested, the interpretation of Deity not as a person, but as a quality. A quality, whose initial stages, as Huxley suggests, spread all through nature and, at the stage of humanity, becoming conscious to man himself and recognizable to his fellows. Being or becoming fully conscious, man is now able, not only to strive towards this quality, but also in some measure to promote its development.

“Since the belief has ceased that a God directs in general the fate of the world, and, in spite of all apparent crookedness in the path of humanity, leads it on gloriously, men themselves must set themselves œcumenical aims embracing the whole earth.”²

At present we can have some idea of what this quality can be, although it is beyond any of us to realize anything like fully. However, we have already indicated that this quality comprises Truth, Beauty and Goodness compounded into complete Harmony and Happiness through Love. If then this quality is inherent in man and is being developed in and by man, then not only do we get rid of the personalization of God, which presents so many intellectual and indeed moral difficulties, but we also get rid of any necessity for postulating a Devil or adversary of God. Evil, pain and suffering are merely expressions of incompleteness, of the fact that man has not got far enough along the line of his progressive path towards Deity to have got beyond these. We can if we like call the primæval chaos, from which man through countless ages has evolved, Devil, just as we call the perfect Harmony, to which we believe man is, through still more countless ages evolving, Deity or God. But there is no more need to postulate an active, interfering, evil Abaddon (*cf.* Revelation IX, 11) than there is to postulate an erratic, mistaken and often meddlesome Jahveh.

¹ J. Huxley: *Religion without Revelation*.

² F. Nietzsche: *Aphorisms*.

“There is no positive evil, it only comes by absence of good; just as darkness itself does not exist, but only comes by absence of light.”¹

If Deity is at one and the same time a quality partially inherent in man and a quality towards which man is continually reaching out, through however many obstacles and backslidings, we may say with Mazzini:

“We believe in the continuous revelation of God throughout the collective life of humanity.”²

¹ Sallustius (the companion and adviser of Julian the Apostate): *The Gods and the World*, 12.

² J. Mazzini: *From the Council to God*.

HUMANITY AND DEITY

Deity as an Abstraction

It has been suggested that we may accept the conception of Deity as a quality entirely outside the realm of space and time, though of course it may express itself in or through objects which have extension and duration, that is to say, are observable and measurable in space and time. This conception should not be difficult to grasp if we take the analogy of Beauty. Beauty is a quality, which we may perhaps with difficulty conceive as a "thing in itself," but it manifests itself in beautiful things, beautiful lives, beautiful pictures or beautiful sunsets. How then does this concept of Deity relate itself to the universe? First there are three postulates, which we must accept with what Alexander calls "Natural Piety." The first is that the Universe exists, we assume this because we regard ourselves as part of that universe. It is the old Cartesian proposition, "*Cogito ergo sum.*" If I assume anything there must be an I to do the assuming. It might be that the only real existence is the I who assumes. This solipsism has been advanced as a serious proposition in philosophy, but all opinion is against it and we may again assume that I am part of something more, something greater than myself. If there is something greater at all, then there is nothing illogical in assuming that that something is the Universe as a whole and not some particular part of it. This Universe presents itself partly through our senses, as extended in space and enduring through time and partly as that realm of abstraction not related to space or time, of which we are conscious by the process of thought, feeling and will and which we may call the experience of intuition or internal mental awareness, not necessarily derived from direct sensory presentation. Indeed this may lead us nearer to truth than the direct evidence of the senses:

"This life's five windows of the soul
Distorts the heavens from pole to pole
And leads you to believe a lie
When you see with, not through, the eye."¹

The Meaning of the Universe

Given this Universe, we are then left with the second postulate, that it not only exists, but it continues, which raises the question, "how did it get there, how did it begin, and where will it end?" Here we must be content to be agnostic, we don't know and have no means of finding out whether the universe, which we postulate as existing, ever did begin.

¹ W. Blake: *The Everlasting Gospel*, 7.

Our finite minds are not capable of grasping infinity. It seems to us as if everything must have a beginning. But, just because our minds are finite, we have no proof that infinity is impossible. This agnosticism makes it also logical to admit a similar attitude towards the ultimate fate of whatever may be the basis of the Universe, whether it ever will end, or if it does end, how it will end. Therefore we must not take too seriously the pessimistic doctrine of the physicists, of entropy. They say that everything is running down and must ultimately come to a stop, so that it is cold and dead and quite incapable of maintaining life. Really all they say is that our planet or even our solar system will not be able to support life as it exists now, but we cannot be sure that in several million years, life then will be the same as life now. We don't know what the ultimate "thing," which is supposed to be running down, really is; we are told by some that it is no more than a mathematical formula, and we cannot tell whether it might not run up again, as a result of an alteration of the formula, of a reversal of the present process, a reversal which might even be initiated by humanity itself, when, in the course of a few more millennia, it has still further developed its rapidly expanding powers. Since we know nothing of how the universe came into existence and we are learning that so many of the laws of nature, which seemed so immutable, such as that of the conservation of energy and of causality, are subject to exceptions, nothing would seem to be entirely impossible.

Even in human affairs we may agree that:

"In the main, viewing things as ever in the process of change, we see that many ills of yesterday are gone to-day, and this gives us the right to believe that many of the ills of to-day may be gone to-morrow."¹

Change in the Universe

The third postulate which we must assume is that there is some process of becoming in the Universe. It is proceeding somehow to something else. We have assumed and adduced some evidence to show that this process is a progress from chaos towards greater and greater harmony, or, as expressed in the last chapter, from the Devil to God. This is perhaps not altogether an assumption, for the process of becoming is open to observation. We have much more reason for such an assumption now than had Marcus Aurelius when he wrote:

"Can any man discover symmetry in his own shape and yet take the Universe for a heap of disorder?"²

"In the beginning was chaos and void." We admit the chaos but not the void, because, whether or not we admit the possibility of infinite duration, there was this Universe of ours in some form or other, if it were only as a potential mathematical formula. As to chaos, we not only admit it,

¹ Lord Samuel: *Belief and Action*.

² Marcus Aurelius: *Meditations*.

but are prepared to demonstrate it as a fact, or at least as a highly probable theory. Science is teaching us with more and more certainty that there was chaos—a whirling nebula of incandescent gases and that this chaos has gradually shaped itself and formulated itself until, through the process of evolution, it has emerged into the Universe of which we are a part to-day. Materially, if we are looking at it from that point of view, this progress from the whirling nebula to the world as we see it in the present, is demonstrable in the chemistry of the rocks, in the chemistry which gave rise to life, and we are not far from understanding that chemistry,¹ and finally in the evolution of the various forms of life up to man, with his dominating brain and mind. Mathematically, if we like to look at it from that point of view, it is capable of proof, by means of formulæ of more and more specific and related types. No doubt we have still a lot to learn as to the details of this mathematical sequence, though the gaps are being filled. Spiritually, if we look at it from the aspect of the significant value of its progress towards Harmony and Happiness through Truth, Beauty and Goodness, there is evidence of similar progress if we think in terms of large enough sections of time.

The Nature of Universal Laws

Our thesis, therefore, which, if we are to get any further, we must accept with natural piety, is that there is an existing Universe apart from our individual selves, that it continues and that in that continuation it progresses according to certain laws. We must admit agnosticism as to how these laws were established and to a large extent, as to how they are kept in operation. Lloyd Morgan² describes the continuation of the Universe as under the control and direction of intervenient Deity. He therefore regards the quality, which is the ultimate goal of evolution, as being inherent in the whole process and exercising a guiding and directing influence. This would seem to be a perfectly legitimate theory, but it is, of course, quite incapable of proof.

We need not insist too much on an exact explanation of how the laws work, as we cannot know. They may be inherent in the Universe, in other words part of the mathematical formula which is the Universe, without any particular intervention, if we mean by this influence from the outside. The trouble about the term intervention is that it implies someone or something intervening, whereas it is suggested that the same result may follow from an inherent tendency, which, so to speak, works from the inside and not the outside. The essential point for our acceptance is that it would appear, on our assumption of progress, that the Universe evolves according to certain laws, which the sciences of physics, chemistry and biology are enunciating from one point of view with increasing clarity and accuracy.

¹ cf. J. B. S. Haldane: *The Origin of Life*.

² J. Lloyd Morgan: *Life, Mind and Spirit*.

The General Application of the Laws

These laws are, however, general laws and operate for the whole and not for the individual part and our attention is apt to be concentrated on a very small part of the universe and to consider the whole entirely from the standpoint of that small part. Again, these laws do not necessarily operate continuously through all time, they may be effective up to a point and then be replaced by other laws, which are better adapted and more effective at the stage of progress then reached, assuming always that progress really does take place. We have already seen that the laws, which we used to consider immutable, are only operative within certain limits of space, but are not applicable to the very large or the very small, i.e. in outer stellar space or within the atom. Moreover, there are several laws operative and it does not follow that they are all, at all times, compatible. They may, consequently, come into conflict with each other at certain periods and the results of the conflict may start an entirely new line of progress.

This may be illustrated from the story of animal evolution. According to Darwin, evolution at the animal level is subject to the laws of inherent variation, which may be larger than was at first thought (mutations), and natural selection operating on these variations. At one period there was a phase of high temperature operative over most of the earth and natural selection produced the golden age of the reptiles, with the giant dinosaurs and other forms. But the action of this tendency for increase in size, with the abundance of food supply, came into conflict with the factors determining the alterations of temperature on the earth's crust and atmosphere. When a cold period came, and vegetation became more scarce, the reptiles failed to survive because the available food supply was insufficient to support them and they became extinct.

This apparent mistake in evolution was then simply a temporary resultant of two opposing laws or tendencies of nature. But the mistake has not made any ultimate difference to the main stream of evolutionary progress and this is still working along the lines of natural selection. The further progress along these lines has produced the highly adaptable man, whose appearance we have no reason to think was delayed by the "mistake" of the reptiles. But in the process of evolution under natural selection many diverse forms have naturally appeared, because the only requisite was that they could adapt themselves to the circumstances of their environment at the particular time. Since environmental conditions are not constant, any particular tendency in evolution is not necessarily constant either. Thus very long ago the ammonites arose and vanished, but other molluscan forms have survived, just as certain smaller reptiles have survived because they have managed to find an environment to which they could adapt themselves, or more probably because their powers of adaptation have enabled them successfully to adjust themselves to more than one form of environment.

So the amoeba has evolved in water containing organic material and

but are prepared to demonstrate it as a fact, or at least as a highly probable theory. Science is teaching us with more and more certainty that there was chaos—a whirling nebula of incandescent gases and that this chaos has gradually shaped itself and formulated itself until, through the process of evolution, it has emerged into the Universe of which we are a part to-day. Materially, if we are looking at it from that point of view, this progress from the whirling nebula to the world as we see it in the present, is demonstrable in the chemistry of the rocks, in the chemistry which gave rise to life, and we are not far from understanding that chemistry,¹ and finally in the evolution of the various forms of life up to man, with his dominating brain and mind. Mathematically, if we like to look at it from that point of view, it is capable of proof, by means of formulæ of more and more specific and related types. No doubt we have still a lot to learn as to the details of this mathematical sequence, though the gaps are being filled. Spiritually, if we look at it from the aspect of the significant value of its progress towards Harmony and Happiness through Truth, Beauty and Goodness, there is evidence of similar progress if we think in terms of large enough sections of time.

The Nature of Universal Laws

Our thesis, therefore, which, if we are to get any further, we must accept with natural piety, is that there is an existing Universe apart from our individual selves, that it continues and that in that continuation it progresses according to certain laws. We must admit agnosticism as to how these laws were established and to a large extent, as to how they are kept in operation. Lloyd Morgan² describes the continuation of the Universe as under the control and direction of intervenient Deity. He therefore regards the quality, which is the ultimate goal of evolution, as being inherent in the whole process and exercising a guiding and directing influence. This would seem to be a perfectly legitimate theory, but it is, of course, quite incapable of proof.

We need not insist too much on an exact explanation of how the laws work, as we cannot know. They may be inherent in the Universe, in other words part of the mathematical formula which is the Universe, without any particular intervention, if we mean by this influence from the outside. The trouble about the term intervention is that it implies someone or something intervening, whereas it is suggested that the same result may follow from an inherent tendency, which, so to speak, works from the inside and not the outside. The essential point for our acceptance is that it would appear, on our assumption of progress, that the Universe evolves according to certain laws, which the sciences of physics, chemistry and biology are enunciating from one point of view with increasing clarity and accuracy.

¹ cf. J. B. S. Haldane: *The Origin of Life*.

² J. Lloyd Morgan: *Life, Mind and Spirit*.

The General Application of the Laws

These laws are, however, general laws and operate for the whole and not for the individual part and our attention is apt to be concentrated on a very small part of the universe and to consider the whole entirely from the standpoint of that small part. Again, these laws do not necessarily operate continuously through all time, they may be effective up to a point and then be replaced by other laws, which are better adapted and more effective at the stage of progress then reached, assuming always that progress really does take place. We have already seen that the laws, which we used to consider immutable, are only operative within certain limits of space, but are not applicable to the very large or the very small, i.e. in outer stellar space or within the atom. Moreover, there are several laws operative and it does not follow that they are all, at all times, compatible. They may, consequently, come into conflict with each other at certain periods and the results of the conflict may start an entirely new line of progress.

This may be illustrated from the story of animal evolution. According to Darwin, evolution at the animal level is subject to the laws of inherent variation, which may be larger than was at first thought (mutations), and natural selection operating on these variations. At one period there was a phase of high temperature operative over most of the earth and natural selection produced the golden age of the reptiles, with the giant dinosaurs and other forms. But the action of this tendency for increase in size, with the abundance of food supply, came into conflict with the factors determining the alterations of temperature on the earth's crust and atmosphere. When a cold period came, and vegetation became more scarce, the reptiles failed to survive because the available food supply was insufficient to support them and they became extinct.

This apparent mistake in evolution was then simply a temporary resultant of two opposing laws or tendencies of nature. But the mistake has not made any ultimate difference to the main stream of evolutionary progress and this is still working along the lines of natural selection. The further progress along these lines has produced the highly adaptable man, whose appearance we have no reason to think was delayed by the "mistake" of the reptiles. But in the process of evolution under natural selection many diverse forms have naturally appeared, because the only requisite was that they could adapt themselves to the circumstances of their environment at the particular time. Since environmental conditions are not constant, any particular tendency in evolution is not necessarily constant either. Thus very long ago the ammonites arose and vanished, but other molluscan forms have survived, just as certain smaller reptiles have survived because they have managed to find an environment to which they could adapt themselves, or more probably because their powers of adaptation have enabled them successfully to adjust themselves to more than one form of environment.

So the amoeba has evolved in water containing organic material and

has survived in its simple form, whether the water was warm or cold, plentiful or scarce. The tapeworm has found a habitat in the gut of mammals, the plasmodium, which is responsible for malaria, has found its habitat for part of its life in the mosquito and part of its life in the blood of man, producing, incidentally, a widespread and often fatal disease; the tiger in the jungle preys on its fellow mammals and thereby maintains its own existence, at least in certain parts of the world. From the natural selection point of view there is no reason why this should not be so, although to man it may appear to be all wrong, especially if he thinks of the universe as something constructed for his own benefit by a personal God, who, he would like to think, is exclusively concerned with the welfare of man. It has been suggested, however, that this earth at least and living matter upon it may be coming under the operation of a new law, which will gradually replace natural selection as the guiding principle of organic evolution. This new law is that of selective breeding conducted under the intelligent guidance of man. If this law becomes operative, then we may expect that all the enemies of man will become extinct, just as the ammonites and reptiles became extinct.

Deity need not be Infallible

There is no need then, to postulate a beneficent, omnipotent, personal God, who, in spite of the attribute of benevolence and omnipotence, makes mistakes, allows diseases and permits of cruelty. The process of progression necessitates these aberrations, but eventually, because different laws operate at different times, they correct themselves or become corrected and, in the long run, progress marches on and, if a long enough view is taken, the mistakes and cruelties do not matter.

Selective breeding if it really becomes effective would soon eliminate the tapeworm, the malaria parasite, and even the tiger. The common amoeba, being harmless to man, might survive if he could, so long as he kept himself to the ponds and did not, like his cousin the entamoeba histolitica, take to living in our guts. But that amoeba will have to be eliminated, together with other diseases-producing parasites, probably by killing off otherwise harmless animals, in which they spend part of their life cycles, as, for example, we try to kill off mosquitoes in our efforts to stamp out malaria.

Man shaping his own Destiny

When we come to man himself we begin to see, as has been said, a level being reached, at which the highest product of evolution is himself taking a hand in modifying the whole process of evolution. The power of modifying his environment is sometimes called free will and regarded as something with which man is specially endowed by a supernatural power, to justify the rewards and punishments in an after-life. This apparently had to be postulated to reconcile the inequalities of this life with the beneficence of an all-powerful God. But may not this

so-called free will be the result of the elaboration of an inherent quality of the stock from which man is derived, just as his power of reflective thought, his prospective judgment and almost limitless capacity for adaptation would seem to be.

"Thus the mind finds itself equipped with leading principles for the co-ordination of that living entity, of which it is itself the reflective awareness; by the direction which it gives to attention it determines the form of co-ordination or integration which takes place. It is here in this consistent direction of attention (to Truth, Beauty and Goodness) rather than in the moment of action that freedom is found to be effectively present."¹

Zest and Reverence

We have seen before that there are two impulses recognizable in the personality of the average man, which are likely to promote the process of progression and indeed to accelerate it with an ever-increasing velocity. These are firstly zest, the impulse to work, to strive, to be doing something rather than to remain idle. It does not need the exhortations of the philosopher to induce the normal man to try to better himself and he will readily enough agree to the call:

"Believe that life is worth living and your belief will help create the fact."²

The impulse to strive, good and productive as it may be, does not necessarily make for progress, for it may be, and too often is, directed to the ends of selfishness and greed and not to those of altruism and mutual aid. But, if it is combined with the other impulse, which is to look to and reach towards something above and beyond himself, mutual aid at one end of the scale and a striving towards the quality of Deity at the other, then progress may easily be effected with greater and greater rapidity, the more man's wisdom enables him to identify that something, which is above and beyond himself, with the highest absolute value and the more he acquires the power to modify his environment and himself. As Adler says, "The meaning of life is co-operation." As we have seen, this impulse of what we may call active reverence, of reaching for something higher, is the factor in man to which the various forms of religion have appealed, but the religions themselves evolve and will be modified by man's will. As Canon Wilson has said:

"I cannot but say that I believe that some day our conception of God will have become independent of nearly all that has come into it from the primitive Jewish and other pagan conceptions of God, which have passed into Christianity, and that our conception will be constantly renewed and growing from all human knowledge and experience from all science, philosophy and psychology."

¹ W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 237.

² Andre Chenier.

Responsibility for Evil

On this view it does not seem difficult to account for the present existence of evil in the world and we cannot accuse man in his present state of evolution of being entirely responsible for it, or, on the other hand, of being entirely without responsibility.

"True spiritual freedom would be the state of a man who, knowing an ideal which completely satisfied all aspects of his nature, always in fact conformed to it and could perfectly trust himself so to do. . . . Such a soul chooses indeed, but not between any real alternatives for, by its very constitution, it renders one of the alternatives impossible. . . . Such would be true freedom; and it is not ours. We see that it would bring with it that peace which passeth understanding."¹

Although he is beginning to gain some measure of freedom and control, not only of himself, but of the world around him, there can be little doubt that man is not yet completely free and too much should not yet be expected of him.

"Self-determination is the characteristic of man as a moral being, and without it he could never be called into fellowship with God. But it is not the last word of human development; on the contrary it contains the sentence of endless frustration as truly as it affords the opportunity of entry upon the spiritual enterprise. For the self which determines cannot carry the self which is determined above its own level. Self-determination must fulfil itself in a recognition of an other which may lift it for ever out of its reach. Self-determination fulfils itself in self-surrender to that which is entitled to receive the submission of self."²

Until, therefore, our present self evolves and grows further towards Deity, free will must always be limited.

Freedom of Choice

Man is still swayed, to a large extent, not only by the environment, but also by his inherent constitution. When he comes to choose a course of action his choice is based on and determined in large measure by the manner in which his environment works upon the instincts and impulses with which he was born and which he cannot avoid. Nevertheless, even in his instinctive reactions, he is not confined to the simple all or none reaction as is the animal. Further, in virtue of his power to recognize various possibilities and to judge as to how they will modify circumstances in the future, generally with the help of comparisons with memories of past events, he can take the long view. That is to say, he can suppress the impulse which seems to be the stronger at the time and which might have been expected to determine his conduct and which would inevitably have determined the behaviour of the animal.

¹ W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 242.

² W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 244.

Free will, therefore, so far as it does exist, is not a new faculty, "injected" by some supernatural agency into the personality of man, but is derived and elaborated from the basal instinctive reactions which are common to the whole animal kingdom. Let us take a very simple example. A man goes for a walk and after being out for some time comes to a fork in the road. He is tired and hungry and it is obvious that a severe thunderstorm is coming on. He is called upon to "choose" which path he will take and he may think that his choice is free, but let us consider the question in a little more detail. He looks at his map and sees that the left-hand fork turns round and joins another path which will take him back to his base where he can get food. On the other hand, if he takes the right-hand path, he will get to a shoulder of the hill from which he will get a good view and this was the original object of the walk. Thirdly, he is very hungry and to turn back and retrace his steps by the path by which he came would get him home most quickly. But he knows that to go this way would take him over a very exposed bit of open hillside on which he thinks he would get very wet if it came on to rain. If he were swayed entirely by hunger he would go back by the way he came, but that impulse comes into conflict with (a) curiosity, because this is new and beautiful country and he wants to see as much of it as he can and (b) his self-preservation impulses with reference to his future health, apart from his present hunger. He knows that if he gets very wet and cold he may get pneumonia, for he has a weak chest and this would certainly spoil the rest of his holiday and might even endanger his life. These two reasons combined are strong enough to overcome his hunger impulse and so the idea of returning along the path by which he came is abandoned and he has made his first "choice." It should be noted, however, that the reason which led to this choice was at least partially founded on instinctive impulses and was not a matter of entirely free will.

The second choice is more difficult, he is very hungry, but he does want to see the view, that was what he had come all this way to do, so, using his intelligence, he has another look at the map. He sees that a short way round the corner there is marked a farm or possibly a small village. The map gives no indication of an hotel but he thinks he can probably find someone to sell him some milk, which will stave off hunger until he gets back to his base and, in any case, he can probably find shelter if the storm comes on really badly. So he makes his second choice and decides to take the right-hand path. He may consider that in so doing he has exercised free will, but this freedom is not so certain. He has been swayed by three impulses, hunger, curiosity and self-preservation against cold and wet with their possibly serious effects and perhaps a fourth, self-assertiveness, in that, having set out with a definite purpose in view, he was not going to be beaten by anything until he had achieved his object.

The solution of these conflicting influences was certainly helped by the use of his intelligence and in this respect he may be said to have

exercised free will; nevertheless, his behaviour was based on the four instinctive drives which played a considerable part in his decision. Similarly, if analysed, even our very complicated behaviour will be found to be based on such impulses and to be in some measure the resultant of these impulses. If our knowledge was more extensive, there seems no reason why we might not be able to foretell behaviour, just as we can foretell the direction and force of movement of bodies through space, if we know the strength of the forces acting on these bodies and the directions in which such force is applied. Nevertheless it is undoubtedly the case that man is more free than the animals by reason of his intelligence and can modify the resultants to a very significant extent.

The rabbit, if presented with the same choice, would almost certainly have scuttled back to food and shelter the way he had come, unless there had been a particularly active dog behind him, when he would certainly have taken the left-hand path as the quickest way home, if he knew, perhaps by having often travelled that way before, that it was the nearest way to safety. Otherwise he would have been driven by sheer fright along whichever path seemed to let him run the fastest. The man, on the other hand, was able to weigh the evidence and to consider probabilities which he could foresee and this does represent tremendous progress. It may be that eventually man will advance to a stage when, by the use of his intelligence, he can accurately foresee the results of his behaviour when he may entirely overcome the influence of his instinctive drives and then, and then only, will he be able to claim completely free will. When he does that he will be able to modify his environment, perhaps even the whole universe, as he chooses.

Choice at Lower Levels

Consider this theme on more general lines. We must admit that man is still largely driven by his impulses. The most primitive impulses operating in animals are self-preservation and race-preservation, which latter includes both the mating instincts and the parental instincts, leading to the nourishment and protection of the young. The race-preservation instincts will, however, only operate when the mating season is on and the mate is present or near, or when there are young to protect. In ordinary circumstances and for most of the time the self-preservation instincts are the chief determinants of behaviour.

The emotions chiefly associated with these impulses are fear and hunger, to which may be added others in certain circumstances, such as curiosity, self-abasement and self-assertion.

Under primitive conditions, self-preservation means each for himself and the devil take the hindmost. Although certain animals, even quite low in the scale, have found it beneficial for the preservation of the race to go about in shoals and flocks and herds, there is no particular indication

that within the shoal of herrings or the flock of sheep or the herd of buffaloes, the individual herring, sheep or buffalo does not try to get away from danger, just as fast as ever he is able. Admittedly, naturalists have described behaviour in insects and other relatively low forms of life, such as those quoted by Kropotkin, which are not so selfish and which seem almost to amount to deliberate altruism, but such observations are not very numerous and on the whole are not completely convincing. In any case it will not be disputed that under the impulse of self-preservation, behaviour, even in gregarious animals, is selfish, and if the animal is driven by hunger and fear his conduct will be greedy and cruel, for most cruelty is inspired by fear. It might appear that cruelty is often the result of anger, but such cruelty is incidental, while the cruelty born of fear is too often deliberate. Anger results from thwarting and at primitive levels the impulses which are thwarted will be self-preservation and race-preservation. At its higher levels anger is a more desirable impulse than fear, for we may speak of generous anger, but not of generous fear.

Greed for Power

If we consider the evils in the world, the direct causes are almost exclusively selfishness, greed and cruelty. Greed is not necessarily associated with hunger, for man may be greedy for other things than food and the chief of these is power, and here aggression comes into the picture. Man not only desires power to obtain the things he wants, but he wants to be top dog, he wants to assert himself, to dominate others, for the sake of domination. Nor does he express his greed only for the necessities of life, but even more for the non-essentials, the luxuries, which he sees that other people have and enjoy. Consequently, he is driven by his self-assertion to desire to possess bigger and better luxuries than other people so that he can prove himself to be superior. Unfortunately, he is not only driven to this by his impulses, but exercises whatever free will he has in aggrandizing himself or his own immediate circle. The German people have not thrown up Führers during the last two centuries, ever since the time of Frederick the Great, simply to lead them to *lebensraum* and the necessities of life. They have wanted the luxuries of life, but above all they have wanted to prove themselves the Herrenvolk and that all the more because in their heart of hearts they have known that they were nothing of the kind. As John Buchan once pointed out, the Germans have always tended to fill all the meanest and most degrading professions and occupations in the world, and they know it. This aggressiveness, based on an inherent feeling of inferiority, which demands compensation at any price, is a curious phenomenon, but it seldom works out successfully for long and in spite of individual and temporary exceptions it is fairly true that, "to him that hath, more shall be given, and from him that hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away." It looks as if this has been worked out in the case of the aggressive Germans and Japanese.

Religious Cruelty

Even the cruelty of religious persecution, perhaps the worst cruelty of all, would seem to be based on greed and fear. Greed for power, temporal power and the possession of the goods of this earth is strong, but stronger still is the greed of men for spiritual power. How often does mankind wish to dominate the souls of other men, to say to his neighbour, "thou shalt think as I think, thou shalt worship the same God as I worship." But this desire for spiritual domination is largely built on fear, for if one class can subdue the rest and tell them what to do, then it is protecting itself from being dominated in turn. Such men fear, moreover, that unless the slightest opposition in action, or, it may be, heresy in belief, is immediately suppressed by the most cruel and ferocious means in their power, others may realize the hollow, greedy sham that they are and overthrow their power and domination.

So primitive man, swayed by his self-preservative instincts, the slave of his selfishness, greed and cruelty is, on the whole, an evil thing. His impulse to work, his zest, drives him to strive for his own advantage, without respect or regard for anyone else, just as does the animal, whether he is solitary or a member of a herd. His instinct of awe, for reverence has hardly developed at this stage, also drives him to set up cruel gods, who are jealous and vengeful and only to be placated by the sacrifice of everything he holds most dear. So frightened may he become, through the influence of his priests, that strong instincts, such as the parental instinct, may be overwhelmed and he may be driven to the length of sacrificing his first-born son and even himself.

It is noticeable that, even at this early stage of civilization, he finds it more convenient as a rule to placate his gods, not with the lives of his own relatives or with his own personal possessions, but seeks to obtain equivalent credit by the sacrifice of his enemies and part of the loot he has taken from them. His greed and cruelty, therefore, overcome even the fear of his gods, and his gods give him an excuse for further greed and cruelty.

Altruistic Impulses

However, although there are individual men and communities of men who are not very far advanced from this primitive level of evil, there are, and always have been, other influences at work. These influences are concerned with the race-preservation impulses, the instincts of mating, parenthood and to a less extent the herd. Even at the most primitive level the lust of mating does not altogether preclude consideration for the mate and though, when desire is slaked, *hominus tristest* and is apt to forget and disregard the object of his passion, he cannot escape the fact that, since two are involved, consideration of some sort for the other is imperative if he is to obtain full enjoyment of his act. From these lowly beginnings have evolved all the beauty and altruism of civilized love.

"Man doth seek a triple perfection; first a sersual, consisting in those things, which very life itself requireth either as necessary supplements or as beauties and ornaments thereof; then an intellectual, consisting in those things which none underneath man is either capable of or acquainted with; lastly a spiritual and divine, consisting in these things whereunto we tend by supernatural means here, but cannot here attain unto them. They that make the first of these three the scope of their whole life, are said by the Apostle to have no god but only their own belly, to be earthly minded men. Unto the second they bend themselves who seek especially to excel in all such knowledge and virtue as doth most commend men. To this branch belongeth the law of moral and civil perfection. That there is somewhat higher than either of these two, no other proof doth need than the very process of man's desire, which being natural should be frustrate, if there were not some further thing, wherein it might rest at length contented, which in the former it cannot do. For man doth not seem to rest satisfied, either with fruition of that wherewith life is preserved, or with performance of such actions as advance him most deservedly in estimation but doth further covet, nay oftentimes doth manifestly pursue with great sedulity and earnestness, that which cannot stand him in any stand for vital use; that which exceedeth the reach of sense; yea, somewhat above capacity of reason; somewhat divine and heavenly, which with hidden exultation it rather surmiseth than conceiveth; somewhat it seeketh and what that is directly it knoweth not, yet very intensive desire thereof doth so incite it, that all other known delights and pleasures are laid aside; they give place to the search of this but only suspected desire."¹

In the behaviour of animals and man, under the impulse of the parental instinct, there can be no question that unselfish and altruistic behaviour are discernible, even at most primitive levels, the mother and sometimes the father will fight to the death for the protection of their young, and at more advanced stages of civilization will deny themselves even the necessities of life and work for long hours, under the most adverse circumstances, to provide for them.

The Promotion of the Common Weal

The combination of these two impulses, the impulse to get on with life and the impulse to mutual aid, combined and intensified by the impulse to reverence for something beyond, gives rise to all the further progress of mankind.

"For by so many more saying 'ours' there be,
So much the more of good doth each possess,
And more of love burns in that sanctuary."²

From the frantic struggles of primitive man for the necessities of the individual and his immediate family, we see the advance to the recognition of the rights of others, to what Plato called *Dikaiousune*, but:

¹ Richard Hooker: *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*.

² Dante: *Purgatorio* XV, 1, 55 (Laurence Binyon translation).

"*Dikaosune* = Justice, but the word has much wider implications. It really suggests giving other people their due and may be used to represent the general fulfilment of one's duty towards one's neighbour. It thus easily becomes identifiable with the whole of morality."¹

From the rights of others we advance to the needs of others and the desirability of individual sacrifice, whether this is rewarded in "heaven" or not. No doubt some such stimulus was necessary in the early stages in the advance in human morality.

"The wages of every noble work do yet lie in heaven, or else nowhere. . . . The brave man has to *give* his life away. Give it I advise thee, thou dost not expect to *sell* thy life in an adequate manner."²

But as we go still further forward, we reach a stage in which we are concerned, not with the needs, the rights, the rewards of the individual human being, but with the advance of humanity. For this we require faith, but it is the purpose of this book to show that this faith is justified. The more such hope is justified the more nearly shall we approach to happiness. Even now it is claimed that we have reached the stage when the aspirations of Western civilization can be described as:

"The belief in an objective order above and outside the will of men or the State; the belief in the fundamentally spiritual character of man; the belief in the autonomy of the individual; the belief in the community of mankind. These emerge as the essential values of modern Western civilisation."³

As we go further we may claim that:

"Our hope is ever livelier than despair, our joy livelier and more abiding than our sorrows are,"⁴

So, as man advances and acquires a greater measure of intelligent foresight and so of free will, it may be expected, with some degree of confidence, that he will exercise that free will, not on his own behalf, but on behalf of all mankind and that the object of all his endeavours will be the promotion of the common weal. In this way will humanity approach to and indeed create its own Deity, when mankind will have won free of his basal impulses and be able to direct his unfettered endeavour to what seems to him to be really worth while.

¹ G. C. Field: *Plato and his Contemporaries*, pp. 103-4.

² T. Carlyle: *Past and Present*, III, xii.

³ W. Friedman: *World Revolution*.

⁴ R. Bridges: *The Testament of Beauty*, I, 198-99.

APPROACH TO DEITY

The Progress of Mankind

It is clear from the foregoing that man has every reason to be proud that in the relatively short time at his disposal he has managed to advance the quality of humanity from what it was in, say, the 7th century B.C., just before the beginning of "The Glory that was Greece," to the present day. Less than three thousand years of startling progress, not only in material things but in values as well, and at least a million years still to go! It is also clear that humanity is a quality which varies very much, it has varied markedly in this period of time, now advancing and now regressing, but in the end steadily rising in value. There is good reason for arguing that our present generation is not exhibiting a progressive phase, having regard to the occurrence during this time of two devastating world wars; but after all, fifty years are a short time and we are certainly planning to resume progress now that these wars are over.

Furthermore, progress, when it does occur, may not be equal on all fronts at once. For example, in the Renaissance period, when there was unquestionably an advance along the front of appreciation and creation of Beauty and in some measure an advance in knowledge and the search after Truth, Goodness probably advanced very little, for there was much greed and tyranny in that period. The nineteenth century was a period of marked advance in knowledge, but certainly not towards beauty and only to some extent in goodness, although we must admit to its credit that in this age there was a very great advance in social conscience, at least on the part of the community as a whole, though there also seemed to be a considerable advance in individual selfishness and greed.

Although there was little or no advance in knowledge during the mediæval times, there was advance in beauty, for early Flemish and primitive Italian painting, the Gothic cathedrals and, above all, Dante's Divine Comedy stand out as very significant contributions on this front. Apologists of the Roman Catholic Church sometimes claim that during this period Goodness was much more manifest. It is difficult to be sure on this point, as we do not know enough about the condition of the common people, since history does not preserve reliable records of routine day-to-day events, and there is more than a little suspicion that what is regarded as a progress in goodness was more a progress in the power and universal domination of the Roman Church, which is a very different thing.

Regressive Periods

On the other hand, there are periods in history which, although spectacular, were periods of regression rather than progress. The most striking of these was the era of dominance of the Roman Empire; for during "the Grandeur that was Rome" the hard-won knowledge of the Greek philosophers was prostituted to trivial disputations about unimportant points of detail. Architecture and, in large measure, literature, with perhaps the exceptions of Horace and Virgil, were copies of Greek models, which became debased in the process of imitation and, although the codification of law stands to the credit of Rome, there has probably never been a period when cruelty and oppression were more rife and the vaunted rights of Roman citizenship either did not extend to large sections of the population or were more honoured in the breach than in the performance. Again, progress has not been consistent all over the world and amongst the various races of the world. For example, the period of the Renaissance certainly marked progress in European civilization, but marked the decline and final overthrow of the civilizations of Mexico and Peru, such as they were. No doubt these civilizations were of no great merit and that which has replaced them has eventually turned out to be a better one, just as the race of birds and mammals, which has replaced the reptiles, has eventually turned out to be better. In both cases it has taken a long time so to prove itself and the Peruvians and Mexicans cannot have been much impressed by the benevolence of the invading Spaniards, just as the declining reptiles can scarcely have thought, had they been able to think, that the first birds and the first mammals were of much account, since the latter were of the sort of species now represented by the duck-billed platypus. It must have seemed to them most unlikely that such curious creatures would ever challenge their supremacy.

Tolerance and Humility

All this ought to teach mankind that although there may have been a definite progress of his race, that progress is still intermittent and spasmodic and, although there is still plenty of time, he has a very very long way to go, before he can claim that the quality of humanity in any way approaches Deity. It behoves him, therefore, to be humble and diffident as to his achievements and to realize that he still has a lot to learn. Now that he seems in the course of evolution to be developing the power to "pull up his own pants," he is still largely ignorant as to how he is going to achieve this feat. He must therefore beware of thinking that he, or the little coterie to which he belongs, is able to reform the world by this or that particular scheme, or this or that particular form of government. It is no doubt a sign of grace and perhaps a sure sign of his power to promote the progress of his race by his own endeavour that man is so prone to regard himself as a reformer, but the trouble is that he is apt to be so sure that he is right and to be so sure that all the others are

wrong. He forgets that, at present, at any rate, one policy or form of government may suit one group and a different one be better suited to another. It is so difficult for him to resist the temptation of the self-preservation instincts and to avoid using his scheme of reformation to advance his own interests, whether these be material gains in money or titles or just the satisfaction of feeling that he is dominating his fellows. There are few people who are so apt to be puffed up with pride as the leaders of reforming sects, since, for the most part, they have not begun to learn the first great requisites for progress—humility and tolerance. It is frightening how intolerant are the knowledgeable, though not the really wise, people; how jealous is the artist, though not the man who has learnt how to adapt himself to life, to live harmoniously and so beautifully; how prone to persecution are the pious, but not the really good people. We still must admit that:

“For jealousy is the rage of a man,
Therefore he will not spare in the day of vengeance,
He will not regard any ransom;
Neither will he rest content, though thou givest many gifts.”¹

How few there are, who actually are tolerant, who are truly wise, who lead genuinely beautiful lives and are fundamentally good and how many have only the superficial appearances of these virtues, how few in fact who have adopted the Pauline doctrine of love!

How little do men really regard the rights and feelings of others and how much at fault is the politician and especially the religious politician! In a war patriotism may be essential and we may have to be intolerant and condemnatory of our enemies, but we must not base all our standards on war. War, although it may bring out individual virtues, is in itself nothing but evil and while we may have to fight wars if they are forced upon us, do not let us set up war as good in itself and seek war, or light-heartedly undertake it. Let us realize that, however good it may be as a stepping-stone to progress, patriotism is not enough. Loyalty to school, to church, to nation, to religion, is a virtue, but a limited virtue and can never be more than a limited virtue, until there is no more possibility of divided loyalty, until the only loyalty possible is loyalty to all mankind, loyalty, in fact, to the quality of Deity and nothing less. But:

“Man has replaced the gods he once dreamed of; he has found that he is himself a god, who, however realistic he seeks to make his philosophy, himself created the world as he sees it and now has even acquired the power of creating himself, or rather of recreating himself. For he recognises that at present he is rather a poor sort of god, so much an inferior god that he is hardly, if at all, to be distinguished from the Lords of Hell. Meanwhile, every well-directed step, while it brings us ever so little nearer to the far goal around which our dreams may play, is at once a beautiful process and an invigorating effort, and thereby becomes in itself a desirable end.

¹. Proverbs vi.

It is the little things of life which give us most satisfaction and the smallest things in our path that may seem most worth while."¹

Kindliness

Humility and tolerance we must then achieve, for they have not been very conspicuous in human history, but above all we must retain and develop that quality, which, as has been shown, is inherent in us all, though so often overlaid, namely kindliness. Tolerance and kindliness really go together and mainly depend on being able to appreciate the point of view of everyone else. This does not mean that a person should not have an opinion of his own, but, because he does have an opinion of his own, there is no need for him to ram it down everybody's throat and insist that everyone should think likewise. Men must realize that there are many ways to salvation and that different people will find different paths.

Of course the trouble is that at one stage of humanity man was not sufficiently far advanced to find a way out for himself. That underlies the claims of dogmatic religion, which maintain that the body of doctrine enunciated by this or that particular church, is the highest and best and that it is the duty of that church to teach it to "the heathen in his blindness" so that he may be given the chance to tread the path to higher things. There is a certain amount of truth in this and undoubtedly many races and many sections of humanity are not yet sufficiently advanced to choose or even to find out the existence of possible paths for themselves. Missionaries and missionary effort are therefore justified, not only amongst primitive and backward people, but also among sections of more civilized communities; but surely the missionaries of the various sections of one religion at least should have enough love for humanity to work together and not bicker and abuse each other. Obviously it would be a good thing if the great religions of the world could get together and evolve something better still, out of their respective merits, though that presumably is unlikely until they have settled their differences in their own respective fields. What are we to think of missionary spirit, when a native, asked if he is a Christian boy, replies, "No, sah, I be C.M.S. boy. I been taught I must always call myself that in case I be mistaken for a Methodist boy." Whitehead is right when he says:

"The decay of Christianity and Buddhism, as determinative influences in modern thought, is partly due to the fact that each religion has unduly sheltered itself from the other. The self-sufficient pedantry of learning and the confidence of ignorant zealots have combined to shut up each religion in its own forms of thought. Instead of looking to each other for deeper meanings, they have remained self-satisfied and unfertilised."²

As is the case with so many human vices, the basis of this intolerance

¹ Havelock Ellis: *Little Essays of Love and Virtue. The Individual and the Race.*

² A. N. Whitehead: *Religion in its Making.*

and rigidity is fear and lack of confidence. The person or the community which is really confident of his own worth, need not fear rivals and until the different religions learn this confidence they are unlikely to make real progress and they will continue to appear all too much as the blind leading the blind. The Roman Catholic Church sometimes lays claim to this confidence, but its persecution of heretics in the past indicates fear rather than assurance. We have got to cultivate:

"Purity of the personality. . . . Purity is used to indicate the absence of matters or influences which are alien or non-homogenous or extraneous to the thing in question. . . . If a person keeps out of his nature any warring or jarring elements or complications, keeps himself free of all moral or spiritual entanglements and is nothing but himself, whole, simple, integral and sincere, he will also be pure in the vital holistic sense."¹

The Fallibility of Inspired Prophecy

The origin of the trouble lies, in all probability, in the insistence of supernatural, erratic intervention and of Divine revelation to chosen prophets. While this belief is held by these prophets, it is hardly possible for them to admit that their teaching can be in any way inadequate or that any other form of teaching can have any value whatever, since they have received their mandate direct from God. As has already been indicated, we may agree that, on the whole, Christianity is the highest form of religion yet enunciated, because, firstly, it is a practical religion, which, unlike Buddhism, teaches its adherents to face life and to do their best to adapt themselves to circumstances as they are and secondly, unlike Mohammedanism and the Jewish faith, it is founded upon love. Nevertheless, as it is preached to-day, it is an imperfect religion, because it adheres too much to material traditions and because its doctrine of love is incomplete. We need not go so far as Matthew Arnold and wish to throw over all existing religions without more ado:

"Your creeds are dead, your rites are dead,
Your social order, too,
Where tarries he, the Power who said
See, I make all things new."²

The Need for a New Religion

Yet we might well wish for the co-ordinating leader, who would extract from each religion and each sect everything that is wise and kind and tolerant and devise a new and more complete presentation of religion, which would lead humanity towards Deity with a more certain step. If only we could always be wise, for:

"Wisdom is with all flesh according to His gift,
She shall continue with their seed,
And she filleth men with her fruits."³

¹ J. Smuts: *Holism and Evolution*, p. 300.

² Matthew Arnold: *Obermann*.

³ Ecclesiasticus i.

But such a creed must not be rigid, it must allow for individual differences and, where mankind is still incapable of finding out the proper path for itself, it must take the trouble and have the wisdom to decide which particular path is likely to suit the particular individual or the particular community best and set his feet along that path. But it must go further and when man has advanced sufficiently to allow of his making his own choice and determining his own path towards Deity, it must allow him to take it, only interfering enough to save him from gross error and giving him help when he feels he needs it. After all that is how we try to teach our older children to meet the needs of everyday existence in the hurly-burly of our social order, by encouraging them to use their brains and exercise their own initiative.

"It is not given to human beings . . . to foresee or to predict to any large extent the unfolding course of events. In one phase men seem to have been right, in another they seem to have been wrong. Again, a few years later when the perspective of time has lengthened, all stands in a new proportion. There is another field of values. . . . The only guide to a man is his conscience, the only shield to his memory is the rectitude and sincerity of his actions."¹

We cannot, at the present stage of existence, blame a man for being wrong, provided and only provided he has used all his intelligence, used, in fact, everything he has in him to promote the welfare of humanity. But if we train children by encouraging them to use their minds, surely we ought to adopt the same method to train mankind to explore and find that much more important way of living which leads to Deity.

It may be that the Churches are right when they state, or at least imply by their dogmatism, that man is not yet ready to be taught in this way and that in spiritual matters he is still in the infantile stage at which he must be told, "Do this because I tell you to do it and because I tell you that it is good for you." It may still be true for the majority of mankind that:

"Learning by finding out everything for ourselves, although recently very fashionable in certain 'experimental' schools, is actually a very barren policy. Following directions is an essential part of the complete process of learning in a social environment."²

But there is all too little sign that the Churches are making or are contemplating that they might make in the future, any effort to find out whether at least some of mankind are not sufficiently grown up to justify the claim to be taught in the more modern way. Eventually, however, the perfect religion will not be found to come from without or require exposition by a priest or prophet. As man advances he will create and live his own religion in virtue of the quality of Deity which is in him

¹ Winston Churchill: *Tribute to Neville Chamberlain*, 12th Nov., 1940.

² J. L. Gray: *The Nation's Intelligence*.

and towards which he is more and more nearly approaching. Smuts was right when he said:

“Without idealising it unduly we yet feel that it (the universe) is very near and dear to us and, in spite of all antagonisms and troubles, we come in the end to feel that this is a friendly universe. Its deepest tendencies are friendly to what is best in us and our highest aspirations are but its inspiration. Thus behind our striving in our human advance are in the last resort the entire weight and momentum and the inmost nature and trend of the universe.”¹

The Need for a Fresh Outlook in Politics

As with religion, so with politics and, if it is true that a people get the sort of government that they deserve, it is not very encouraging to contemplate the sorts of governments which are in power to-day and it might appear that man has not advanced very far along the road to wisdom and that he is not yet fit to be let out of leading strings. If advance is to take place, however, the same must apply in politics as in religion, we must cultivate humility, toleration and kindness and we have to get rid of selfishness and greed, both in the individual and in the community. It must be realized, too, that if as a whole we have not got very far on the road to Deity, some may have travelled farther than others. In other words men are not all equal and all are not yet ready to enjoy the same conditions; some cannot use freedom wisely, others are being hampered in their development by too much coercion. Again this applies to individuals, communities and races.

We have already suggested that we may claim progress, because, for example, there are a larger number of people capable of reaching a given standard of education than there used to be and a larger number capable of appreciating beauty and even adapting themselves successfully to life, having regard to the very great increase of complexity and tempo of existence in recent times. More, too, seem to be willing to sacrifice their own interests for the sake of others, if only in social activities and charitable work generally, though no doubt some people would be found to deny this last, if not all three propositions, maintaining that man is more selfish and greedy than ever he was.

We may have to agree, therefore, that political leaders, like religious leaders, are still necessary. For a long time to come those whose intellect is superior to that of the masses will have to act as guides to the rest and superior races will have to take on responsibility for those who are less well advanced. When the time comes that man has reached the quality of Deity, if by then man is still man, everyone will probably have an equal capacity and all being perfected in Truth, Beauty and Goodness, no leaders will be necessary or indeed possible; but from that time we are still very far. To assume therefore that we have already reached that quality, and that neither individual leaders nor superior races are

¹ J. Smuts: *Holism and Evolution*, p. 340.

necessary for the world's progress, is to be blindly foolish and indeed it means that in our arrogance about the achievements of the human race, we lack the first necessary quality of humility.

There does not seem, however, any good reason to assume that one particular form of government is suitable for every community or every nation, nor is it possible to say with confidence what form of community will be best served by any particular form of government. We are still at the stage of trial and error with very few established standards to guide us.

It was the great mistake of the peace conference after the first world war that the representatives of the great powers were so sure that they knew what was good for the little peoples and by imposing these opinions on them they sowed the seeds of another worse war twenty years later. It may be that some communities will best be governed by a dictator, others by an oligarchy, others by a democracy and others again by some form of communism. It does not seem likely that anything like complete communism is possible yet, since leaders there must be, and the only experiment in practical communism has ended up in something which is very hard to distinguish from a dictatorship. But each community must be tolerant of others, both in principle and practice, that is to say they must not seek to impose their own form of government on others, or to exploit a weaker or smaller community for the sake of its own greed or selfish ends in order to obtain money or power or what we are pleased to call glory. If the stronger are to take control, then what is supposed to be the policy of the British Empire, but which in certain colonies is most certainly disgracefully perverted, must be put into universal practice. This is that the people should be governed for their own advantage and that they must be trained to manage their own affairs at the earliest possible moment. How far we are from all this is only too painfully obvious when we are still only with difficulty emerging from war, having spent the greater part of our energy and substance on destruction instead of construction.

Even if we could avoid war it is obvious that for some time to come, some sort of police force will be necessary to control both the individual and at any rate some of the communities. If this police control is to be successful, it will have to be exercised over the less advanced people by those who are determined to work for the good of all mankind and not in the interests of one individual or one nation. A police force of any sort must of course be incorruptible, but it must work entirely for the people whom it controls and not for the advantage and interests of the people who put it in control.

Virtue on a National Scale

If we are to achieve this ideal, we must have, not only individuals whose chief driving forces in life are honesty, self-sacrifice and dignity, but whole nations who are inspired by these qualities. That there are

such persons, we have no doubt at all and they are the people who ought to be selected as leaders of the rest. But the very factors in their make-up which fit them to be leaders, namely humility, self-sacrifice, dignity and honesty, would seem to make it less likely that they will either push themselves forwards to take power as dictators or oligarchs or submit themselves to the turmoil of the hustings in a democratic regime. That we have been able to achieve at least some such leaders is a credit to the advance of mankind, but looking round the world as it is to-day, it is all too evident that the qualities enumerated above are not the characteristics of the leaders in power in the various nations. Still less, perhaps, are nations as a whole imbued with the proper spirit and we find those, who at least pay lip-service to the desirability of leading the more backward races forward into the light, too often decline the responsibility of undertaking the task, while those who will undertake this responsibility, fail to resist the temptation to exploit their weaker brethren for their own material benefit or for their lust for power and spiritual self-satisfaction. Perhaps, alas! the pessimism of Tolstoi is still true, but that his vision is true there can be no doubt.

“On this earth there is no truth; all is false and evil: but in the universe, in the whole universe, truth has its kingdom, and we who are now children of the earth are none the less children of the universe. Do I not feel in my soul, that I am actually a member of this vast harmonious whole? I make one link, one step between the lower beings and the higher. Truth and virtue exist; and man’s highest happiness consists in striving for their attainment.”¹

The Training of Leaders

Whatever form of government a nation chooses or even has imposed upon it, the problem for the immediate future would seem to be how to select and train leaders. Up till now the only selection has been that leaders who have come to power have tended to belong to the so-called aristocratic classes, though some of the prominent leaders of our own time such as Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler have not been aristocratic. For many reasons the aristocratic class is not what it was and the capacity and even the desire of its members for leadership have lessened. This may be due on the one hand to inter-breeding and the deterioration of stock, and on the other hand to an opposite cause, namely the introduction of less desirable characteristics, through admixture with an alien stock. It is also unquestionably due to a curtailment of their privileges and lowering of their economic status and also in the opportunities for gain if they did take the lead. The dethronement of the aristocratic leader, as indeed of any other leader, is desirable in so far as his behaviour was dictated by greed and selfishness, but undesirable in so far as his behaviour was determined by real enthusiasm for the common weal and actuated by what used to be called the spirit of *noblesse oblige*. The decay of this spirit

¹ L. Tolstoi: *War and Peace*.

has resulted in a vicious circle, the more privileges were curtailed the less did the aristocracy see why they should shoulder responsibility and the less they shouldered responsibility the less did they deserve to obtain privilege.

It has taken two wars to bring home to the nations of the earth the principles of selection of personnel and necessity for choosing the right man to fill particular jobs. Some complain that specialism has run mad, but there seems to be little doubt that the world is becoming much too complex to permit of the leadership of the all-round genius, knowing sufficient about everything to be able to fill any job, as seemed possible, for example, in the Elizabethan age. Perhaps when mankind has again advanced in intellectual capacity and his sense of proportion has caught up with his achievement, the man of all-round brilliance may again come into his own. But the present is an age of specialism and one of the most important specialities is political leadership. Unfortunately this business of selection is still very much in its infancy and we can formulate very few rules. We must therefore, as in many other matters, proceed largely by trial and error and gradually work out, firstly, what are the qualities which we wish to find in our leaders and secondly, how are we to recognize these qualities in childhood and adolescence, so that the special training, which these future leaders will require, may be undertaken by what John Buchan called midwives to genius and thirdly, how this particular training is to be carried out. It will doubtless take us a long time to answer these problems satisfactorily and we shall make many mistakes on the way. We shall select the wrong people for the wrong qualities and train them in the wrong way but we shall learn by our mistakes. While many generations may have to suffer, as the last two generations have had to suffer, from inefficient and mistaken leadership, even that is of small account, if eventually it becomes possible for the true leaders of the people to be found and trained, so that everyone will work and work with only one object in view, namely the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

The Necessity to Envisage the Goal

At present most people are paying far too much attention to the trees and far too little to the wood. They spend their time and their energy in worrying as to exactly how and by what form of government this happiness is to be brought about, before they have defined in their own minds exactly of what this happiness should consist and before they have divested themselves of the old ideals of material advantage and self-aggrandizement. Until the people at large have been persuaded that there is such a thing as happiness to which they may look forward and taught how to work for it, by thinking of all instead of each, no progress can be made. Then let them find and train the men that can lead them to the goal and, freed from personal ambition, the leaders will in turn train the people to strive towards and eventually reach the goal of Deity.

Then they will no longer need leaders, for they will have reached the blessed state when all will have achieved the quality of Deity. First the leaders and then the people must adopt as their religion as well as their politics that the quality of Deity must be attained, for:

“A man’s religion is the thing a man does practically believe (and this is often enough without asserting it to himself, much less to others), the thing a man does practically lay to heart and know for certain concerning his vital relations to this mysterious universe and his duty and destiny there—that is in all cases the primary thing for him and creatively determines all the rest.”¹

Then and only then shall we be able to say wholeheartedly with Miranda:

“How many goodly creatures are there here,
How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world
That hath such people in it.”²

¹ Thomas Carlyle.

² W. Shakespeare: *The Tempest*, v, i.

THE INDIVIDUAL SOUL

The Holistic Conception of the Soul

Having traced the destiny of mankind and what should be the aim of man's endeavour, we are now in a position to return to our original theme, namely the conception of what is a soul. It was suggested that the soul was not part of the body and could not be discovered by analysing the body, either materially by dissection or intellectually by logic, but that on the other hand the soul was to be defined as the whole of the personality in its complete relationship with the environment, from the moment of conception to the moment of death, taking also into account what it owed to hereditary factors and social heritage handed down to it from all its ancestors.

This conception of wholeness is not easy to grasp, but more and more writers have elaborated it lately, especially since the publication of Smuts's *Holism*. The philosophic impetus was given to the conception by the theory of Emergent Evolution which we owe to Alexander and Lloyd Morgan. The basis of the idea of emergence may be found in Browning's description of a musical chord, "Not three notes, but a star." The chord is not simply the summation of three separate notes, it emerges as something quite different, with properties and qualities all its own; and moreover, it cannot be adequately described in terms of its parts. Further, the essence of the chord is not the ivory keys—the things—which produce it, but the quality of the sound. So our conception of the soul is a whole, it is not the brain or the glands, the germ cells or the chromosomes, or even the ideas or feelings of the individual. All these things contribute to the soul as the notes contribute to the chord, but the soul emerges as a quality, different in nature and substance from its parts.¹

Emergence

The principle of Emergence may be better understood from examples from the familiar world of material "things." Chemistry illustrates this principle admirably, for chemical compounds and indeed the elements themselves depend on the form and arrangement of the molecules rather than on their different properties, as at first sight might be imagined.

¹ cf. S. Butler: *Erewhon Revisited*.

"Man's vicarious life is not affected by the dissolution of his body; and in many cases the sum total of a man's vicarious action and of its outcome exceeds to an almost infinite extent the sum total of those actions and works, that were effected through the mechanism of his own physical organs. In these cases his vicarious life is more truly his life than any that he lived in his own person."

Carbon in one form is coal, and in another is a diamond, both with unique characteristics which differ from one another profoundly, yet this difference depends not on different kinds of molecules, atoms or electrons, but on how they are arranged in relation to each other. So with water, which is the product of the union in a certain form of two atoms of hydrogen with one atom of oxygen, and has properties quite different from the component parts and from deuterium or heavy water with the same formula and different again from hydrogen peroxide, which is still just hydrogen and oxygen. Attention has already been drawn to the enormous number of different combinations of hydrogen, oxygen and carbon, which are studied in organic chemistry and each of these bodies "emerges" differently according to the way in which their atoms and molecules are arranged.

Emergence of Life

When we come to study the emergence of life, which is now very nearly clear to us as a result of the knowledge gained about bacteriophages, viruses and such-like bodies, we need no longer think of life as some sort of spark, introduced somehow, and from somewhere unspecified, into an inert mass of the four elements from which protoplasm is composed, but as a quality, which pertains to, and emerges from, the whole conglomeration of the essential atoms and molecules, when they are arranged in a certain order and a certain form, the "map" of which only just escapes us.

Emergence of Mind

So with mind, we must not, according to this theory, consider it as something introduced from outside into living beings, but as an emergence, resulting from the working of a certain conglomeration of nerve cells arranged in a certain way. Once life has emerged, as Lloyd Morgan has pointed out, there is no particular difficulty in viewing the progress of living organisms up the evolutionary scale and, since one of the characteristics of life is reaction to the environment by response to stimuli, the only difficulty is to determine at what point, for purposes of description, we are to say that a mind exists and has definitely emerged. We are inclined to say that an amoeba has no mind, yet by its flowing movements it will approach its food and ingest it, it will avoid a spot of acid on a slide; it will remain static in an encysted state or show marked activity, almost to be described as excitement, when it produces its kind by fission. Certainly this single cell behaves as if it liked the food and disliked the acid; as if it felt pleasure when it contacted the one and pain when it contacted the other. It behaves as if it were capable of going through a phase of lethargy and even boredom in the encysted stage and ecstasy, perhaps in very slow motion, in the process of fission. It seems as if it exerted the will to advance or retire, to remain still, or to become very active, in accordance with its feelings inspired by the stimuli coming both from the environment and from its own body. But all these are

mental functions and we have no hesitation in describing them as mental activities when we observe analogous behaviour in a man in similar situations.

The reason we do this is because we assume that the organism under observation is undergoing the same sort of experiences as we do in similar circumstances and we are aware that these experiences satisfy the definition of what we call mental phenomena. Of course we have no idea as to what may be the subjective experience of the amoeba, or whether he has any such experience at all, but, if we are to regard mental and physical phenomena as obverse aspects of the same whole process, as has been suggested previously, then it is doubtful if we should deny to the amoeba some dim beginnings of a mind.

Mind a Manifestation of the Working of Brain

Mind, then, is no fresh introjection into the living being, but an integral function of the working of the body. Furthermore there is every reason to suppose that it emerges in its full development principally as a result of the working of the cortex of the brain in the higher animals. Again, recent work shows that in many respects the cortex works as a whole and that much of its highest function depends on this holistic working and not on the activity of the various parts. This is supported by the fact that interference with mental function such as is met with in mental deficiency and in dementia is not dependent on localized lesions, but on failure of development or degeneration of the cortex as a whole. These mental functions are, in fact, often not interfered with by local lesions and show no signs of deterioration until a certain proportion of the whole brain is destroyed by disease or injury. This does not imply, of course, that local injuries of the brain have no effect, for they most certainly do. Local injury may interfere with speech, movement, vision and many other functions, but does not reduce general mental capacity, unless the injury is very extensive.

Lashley, having trained rats to find food in the centre of a maze, so that they threaded their way without deviating down the blind alleys, found that, if he avoided injury to the particular parts of the brain concerned with movement, sight and so on, he could experimentally remove portions of the brain up to a point, without interfering with the animal's ability to find the food. Directly, however, a certain proportion of the brain had been destroyed, the rats were no longer able to find food. Within limits he varied the positions of the portions of the brain which he removed, but this made no apparent difference to the results, which showed that for this process of learning and retaining the memory of what was learnt, it was the mass of brain that mattered, not the exact position of any particular piece. In order to have an efficient mind, we must have the brain working efficiently as a whole and not only the whole brain, but the whole body must be in a good state of health, if the brain is to perform its work satisfactorily. The more complex the brain, its function

will be manifested at a higher level and response to stimuli, though slower, will be better adjusted to a complex environment.

"Whatever, therefore, tends to lessen undue speed of nervous reaction, whatever tends to increase the difficulty of translating nervous reaction into practical action, so that reflection may achieve its perfect work, will make good for the good of the world."¹

This means that our mental processes depend, to a very large extent, on how complex is our brain and how the whole of our body works. Apart from the brain and the nervous system, the most important of the organs on whose regular and proper function mind depends are the endocrine glands. We know that they will alter the way that the mind works from day to day and almost from hour to hour, and that any permanent over-action or under-action, as occurs in the case of the thyroid gland in Graves' disease (exophthalmic goitre) on the one hand and myxoedema on the other, will make a profound difference to the mental life of the patient and indeed to his whole personality and appearance. But so will temporary or permanent alterations in the circulation, the digestion, or in the removal of waste products, and thus we may say that mind at its best is the product of the smooth working of the entire body acting as an integrated whole. We cannot have mind without body and at the human level, at any rate, we cannot have body without mind. *A fortiori*, we cannot have soul without mind and body, and both as wholes go to make up the soul. But there is still more to the soul than this. There is the environment which surrounds the individual.

The Interaction of the Mind with the Environment

The mind is the means whereby we, as individuals, find access to and interaction with our environment, with the things and people around us. By our processes of cognition we recognize and come to know all that is happening at any moment; by our functions of discrimination, integration and reference in time and space, which are amongst the highest functions of the brain experimentally verifiable, we can choose out the salient features of these events and build them up into a body of significant memories, which we can recall more or less accurately and more or less at our own desires. But so far in our evolutionary progress only more or less, for our memories are by no means always accurate or complete, nor are the things which we remember always significant. Sometimes we find it extremely difficult to recall memories at the time we want to, or even at all. Psycho-analysts have shown us that there are some things which are so firmly repressed, that we cannot normally recall them at all, unless very special methods are used, which are included in the psycho-analytic technique. Other impressions though received through the senses at the same time are not registered, or are registered so feebly, that the memory of them soon fades and they are finally and irrevocably lost.

¹ Havelock Ellis: *Impressions and Comments*.

By our powers of judgment and foresight we can have at least a pretty shrewd idea as to how things are going to turn out in the future, though at present, at any rate, however great the probability may be, these forecasts must remain very largely a matter of guesswork.

The significance of cognitive functions in our conception of the soul is, that the more an individual knows, the better his judgments are, the more accurately he can foresee the future, the greater contribution he will make towards ultimate and absolute Truth and the better will he be able to guide, not only his own conduct, but also that of others. It will be remembered that it was postulated that the idea had no dynamic influence on behaviour, but served as a "map," whereby direction could be given to the dynamic affective impulses which drove the individual into action.

The Interaction of Individual Souls

(a) Intellectual

The essential significance of the soul, it is suggested, is its integration with the environment, the way in which it, the emergent whole of all aspects of the individual, modifies other souls and it does this both during life and after death.

"No man is an Iland, intire of it selfe; every man is a piece of the Continent, a part of the maine; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the lesse as well as if a promontorie were; as well as if a Mannor of thy friend's or of thine owne were; any man's death deminishes me, because I am involved in Mankinde, and therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."¹

It is clear that any individual contribution to the "map of conduct," great or small, right or wrong, is going to influence the whole "map" on which the behaviour of mankind is based. Any contribution to knowledge is beneficially significant provided it is true, but any lie which is incorporated in man's intellectual heritage is maleficiently significant. Any imaginative idea, a poem, a history, a story, even a letter, even an opinion expressed, is an attribute of the individual soul and will make a difference great or small, significant or insignificant to humanity as a whole.

(b) Emotional

Similarly, by our processes of affection we feel the situation and by this means we can estimate its significance for ourselves and others, whether it will bring pleasure or pain, whether it will evoke excitement, tensions or relaxation, whether the situation is dangerous so that it will produce fear, whether it thwarts natural impulses, so that anger will be roused, or strange so that men must seek an explanation to satisfy their curiosity and so on through the whole gamut of emotions.

¹ John Donne: *Sermons*.

These affective aspects of our responses to the various situations of life eventually amalgamate into compound emotions and ultimately sentiments; our loves, our hates, our interests in life, our attitudes to our neighbours, to our church, to our political parties, to our country and to humanity in general. These are all attributes of our individual soul and perhaps more significant attributes than any others. We cannot love without influencing others and, so far as this love is genuine, that is, dominated by altruistic feeling and not by lust or greed, though these may not be absent from the sentiment, that influence will be beneficial. We cannot hate without influencing others, but the influence of hate must always be evil in the end. Even hatred of our enemies, hatred of their evil deeds, hatred of evil itself is only of use, if it acts as a stimulus to correction of evil and above all as a stimulus to our own moral behaviour, so that we may ensure that we shall not become as evil as those we hate.

Our interests and our attitudes cannot but influence others, since man is a gregarious animal and capable of sympathy in its literal sense, a feeling with, a capacity of appreciating and reaching out to the emotional state of others. In this way therefore, the individual soul spreads its influence in an ever-widening circle, through space and, above all, through time and that influence, as John Donne said, is not terminated by the death of the body: "the bell tolls for all." Moreover this influence is to be measured in terms of value and quality. Is this influence good or is it bad? Does it advance or does it retard the quality of humanity? Does it contribute to the beauty of life or to its ugliness? A man's significance in life is his "fame." As Uncle Toby said of the midwife in his circumlocutory way:—

"Her fame had spread itself to the very out-edge and circumference of that circle of importance, of which kind every soul living, whether he has a shirt on his back or no—has one surrounding him; which said circle by the way, whenever 'tis said that such a one is of great weight and importance in the world—I desire may be enlarged or contracted in your worship's fancy, in a compound ratio of the station, profession, knowledge, abilities, height and depth (measuring both ways) of the personage brought before you."¹

(c) *Behaviouristic*

Again by our conative processes we will our actions and set in motion all the behaviour which is characteristic of us as individuals. This question of behaviour is of the very greatest importance, because man has such an enormous power of modifying his environment by his behaviour and will have much more in the future, as we have attempted to show throughout this book.

The Influence of the Lower Animals on Man

Compared to the animals, his power is almost unlimited. Consider a powerful solitary animal like the tiger. In his search for food he can kill

¹ L. Sterne: *Tristram Shandy*, XIII.

a few other animals and this may conceivably make a difference to the habits of their community or even to the continuance of that species. Apart from this he does little or nothing to alter the "go" of nature; all he really does is to eat and sleep and rear his young. In the case of a herd animal such as the buffalo, as a single individual he does even less. Again he only eats and sleeps and reproduces his kind; in the course of doing so he eats some grass, which soon grows again and he helps to fertilize a small piece of ground. Acting collectively as a herd, however, he may do rather more because a large herd of buffaloes might be destructive of a large area of vegetation or, by their movements, they may eat up or refertilize quite a large tract of land so as to alter its ecology to a considerable extent. Even so, they probably do not have such an effect in modifying nature as does a cloud of locusts, which may strip several square miles of country of every sort of green leaf. In doing so they may modify both animal and plant life and even defeat the efforts of man himself to cultivate the land and so maintain himself and his flocks and herds.

Or again, consider the effects of the mosquito or the tsetse fly, which convey the parasites of malaria, yellow fever and sleeping sickness. This may modify the economy of a whole country by conveying widespread disease and killing off horses and cattle and their human guardians themselves. For that matter consider the effects of the various micro-organisms such as those of plague, syphilis and tuberculosis. It is a fascinating study to think of what might have happened if man had not acquired certain diseases.

For example, if Henry VIII had not acquired syphilis, it is probable that Katherine of Aragon would not have suffered from repeated abortions, but would have produced more living children and possibly a son. If a son had been born by her it is possible that Henry would not have divorced her, for the balance of the decision was a fine one and the desire to perpetuate the Tudor dynasty in the male line was a potent factor. Had he not wished to divorce Katherine he might not have quarrelled with the Pope and England might still have been a Catholic country. It might have been that the monasteries would not have been despoiled and, incidentally, if they had not been, the revenue of three of them would not have been amalgamated to provide funds for the foundation of Trinity College, Cambridge. Perhaps the alumni of Trinity, however, may not consider themselves causally related to the spirochaeta of syphilis.

Again, if, in the 1914 war, the Allied armies based on Salonica had not been so completely riddled with malaria that they were completely immobilised, they might have advanced and overrun Bulgaria twelve or eighteen months before they did, thereby ending the war in 1917 and saving hundreds of thousands of lives.

The Influence of Man on Nature

All these examples of lowly forms of life influencing the environment and possibly altering history are only of real importance, in so far as they act in and through men. Even if the tsetse fly harbouring the trypanosomes of sleeping sickness bit thousands of horses and cattle, their death would not make any real difference to the history of the world, if these horses and cattle were not domesticated by man and served as a substantial part of his food supply. It is only because plague, malaria and syphilis affect man that they really matter. Plague is actually a disease of rats and only assumes importance when the rat flea bites a man and so conveys to him the disease. Rats die every day from plague in some parts of the tropics, but unless man is stricken, the death of a million rats is of no importance. They matter because man matters, because it is through man and only through man that the progress of the world can be changed quickly and drastically, for better or for worse; for, if these lower forms of life can alter the face of nature, how much more can man.

Moreover, it is this power to alter nature, to influence his fellow men for good or ill, that gives man his enormous significance and entitles him, it is submitted, to be considered to have a soul. A soul, that is to say, which is significant, for logically according to our definition every living organism must have a soul, but some are more significant than others. This is true, for every living thing modifies its environment in some way, however small. Nevertheless it is only man who modifies his environment in a really significant way. But, it may be argued, what about the bacilli of tuberculosis and of plague, do they not modify the environment, do they not indeed modify the history of man himself? The answer to such an argument is easy: one bacillus can do nothing by itself; to produce effects their numbers must be reckoned in millions. Therefore the single bacillus cannot be compared to the humblest down-and-out and who shall say that the millions of bacilli necessary to produce one sick man have any comparable effect to that of a million men? We are justified, therefore, in postulating that man is the only form of life whose individual soul is sufficiently significant to merit consideration. This influence is not only material, it is directed mainly to the end that values shall be changed and eventually, it is to be hoped, the values attached to the self-preservation instincts—greed, selfishness and pride—shall be changed to values of race-preservation instincts—honesty, generosity and kindness—which will lead to Harmony and Happiness through Truth, Beauty and Goodness.

Man's Modification of Himself

Man, with his mental powers, can therefore modify the world around him, but what is more important, he is beginning to be able to modify himself. The more he can modify himself for good, the greater will be his opportunities for contributing towards the advance of humanity to Deity, in an ever-ascending spiral. But unfortunately the reverse is also

true. If man can modify himself for good he can also modify himself for evil and thus do more and more to retard the progress of humanity.

“Ye have not as it were forsaken me, but yourselves, saith the Lord.”¹

Man can modify his environment by his achievements and also by his behaviour to his neighbours. His achievements may be scientific, artistic or socialistic and behaviour may be kindly or cruel, generous or greedy. What concerns us here is really the significance of his achievements and of course the standard by which we gauge these achievements. Unfortunately, for the most part, the standards still used by the modern world are the wrong ones, namely, money, display and position, instead of Truth, Beauty and Goodness. Man's recent achievements have been mainly directed towards obtaining more direct and easy communications and contacts with his fellows and these have been especially increased by the internal combustion engine, the telegraph, the telephone and the radio. He has also striven to increase comfort and leisure both for himself and others. The increased opportunity for communications must be a good thing if wisely used, for it enables him to expand his knowledge and experience, and also to increase the range and opportunity for good or unfortunately bad behaviour to others, but again it comes down to whether this is used to the end of greed or generosity. Similarly, comfort and even luxury are not to be deprecated, as some people, actuated more by envy than wisdom, are apt to maintain. Comfort and luxury, if distributed and not enjoyed by the few at the expense of the many, are, after all, the basis on which the appreciation of beauty and, if there is the urge to it, the expansion of knowledge may have their best chance. The danger is, of course, that luxury may become an end and not a means and that, under the influence of luxury, probably because the man eats and drinks too much and takes too little exercise, he loses his zest for work and becomes lazy and idle. This, however, will only take place if his guiding principle has been love of himself and not love of his fellows. It is doubtful if the legend that the artist does his best work in a filthy attic by the light of a candle stuck in a bottle has any basis in fact; the real point is that, if there is any real zest for work and an urge for production, it will get itself done anywhere. These words are being written on a packing-case in a hot climate and most of the foregoing was written in a stuffy cabin on a ship at sea in war-time, but they are not thereby rendered any better or worse than if they were written in a comfortably appointed study at home.

The Proper Use of Leisure

Mankind must, as one of his most important tasks, encourage, by example and perhaps by selective breeding, the inherent desire to produce and create on a basis of race-preservation, that is a desire to

¹ Esdras, II, i, 27.

help others. This alone will effect progress and there is no reason to suppose that it will not do so all the better in conditions of comfort if not luxury. But if we are to have comfort and luxury we must realize that they bring their own responsibilities and we must take these very seriously. Leisure and its use is another serious responsibility, for it is necessary for the full development of the soul and this should exercise our minds, perhaps more than our bodies, to a very great extent in the future.

Nevertheless one of the most important responsibilities in wise planning for the use of leisure is the care of the body. Fresh air and exercise are essential for this and it must be remembered that there can be no healthy mind without a healthy body. Opportunity must be given by the provision of open spaces within reasonable distance of home and work, but what exact form of exercise should be taken in these places cannot be discussed here. But it should be remembered that, as in other things, toleration and a due consideration of individual tastes is absolutely necessary. Organized games have their virtues, they foster the team spirit and discourage selfishness, but there is a tendency amongst some people in this country to think that they are the only form of exercise or amusement which has any virtue at all. Doubtless man still requires to be taught to use his leisure wisely, but the teaching should be by guidance not by coercion, for, during leisure hours, activity should be spontaneous and voluntary and not regimented. Of course, if people like to spend their leisure in being regimented, as some people do, especially apparently the Prussian, so be it, but he must be regimented voluntarily and not at the dictates of others.

An increase of knowledge of bodily and mental hygiene and a diffusion of this knowledge more widely throughout the people are imperative, for on this the maintenance of health depends, and without health, no leisure, no comfort, no luxury, is of any use at all. In the future it may be that the most important object of leisure must be to afford the opportunity for broadening and varying mental activity. The mind will not develop to its full, any more than the body will, unless it is allowed plenty of exercise and plenty of freedom of action. It would seem to be a pity therefore for people always to spend their leisure in exactly the same way as some do—the inevitable game of golf on the same course, the inevitable game of dominoes in the same pub, with the same opponent each time, or whatever the particular routine may be, which attracts the conservative sportsman. Variety is the spice of life and without it progress will not be made.

Leisure should also be used for increasing our contacts with our fellow mortals, but here again consideration for the particular characteristics and tastes of the individual must be tolerantly given. All people are not good mixers and some people may give and obtain more benefit from contact with a few intimates than with a large crowd.

The Creation of Beauty

Leisure again can be used for the appreciation and creation of beauty and the professional artist is not the only person who can and does enrich the world's store of beauty. The ordinary man in the street can do all sorts of things. Candide, after savouring all that the world had to offer, came eventually to the conclusion that the sum of human wisdom was "to cultivate our garden." To suggest that everyone should therefore create a garden is going too far. Nevertheless the cultivation of a garden as a thing of beauty is an example of how we may achieve a joy for ever without any special talents, which will not only give pleasure to ourselves but to countless other people.

This brings us to man's artistic achievements, which are of much greater significance than the philistine, bound by his self-preservation instincts, is prepared to admit. The world would be a very poor place if it had lacked its great poets, its great painters and its great musicians, but if these great ones have shed their light on mankind throughout the generations, there is no reason to despise the lesser and more transitory luminaries, whose light shines for a brief moment before their candle is snuffed out. Even the composer of some catchy dance tune, which has brought some momentary joy and happiness to some young men and maidens, has done his part in helping on humanity, for it is obvious that their happiness may have quite an important influence on a number of other people.

It is not given to everyone, however, to write music or to paint pictures or to make immortal, or even very mortal, poetry, but how often can we show a friend something beautiful and by our sympathy and interest in his enjoyment bring happiness to his mind. The joy of a beautiful sunset or a good concert is undoubtedly enhanced if we see it or hear it in company with someone we love, who is sympathetic, who is "seeing it with our eyes" and "hearing it with our ears" and this introduction of beauty to others is of much greater importance than many people realize.

The beautiful, harmonious and peaceful home exercises an unseen but most significant influence on the family which is fortunate enough to live in it, and the harmony and peacefulness of lives is as important as the actual beauty of external things. There is many a wife and mother who is perhaps overshadowed or even totally eclipsed by her brilliant husband or children; but what they owe to the beauty and peace, which her unrelenting care has surrounded them in their home, even they have no idea. They may make a spectacular and significant mark on the world, but would they have done so much, without the background which she provided? This is the beauty, which we can all create about us—if we really try—the beauty of a well-adjusted life, which radiates peace to all around us and perhaps this is the most important beauty of all.

Man's Social Conscience

Men can do this not only individually but collectively and a chapter has already been devoted to the consideration of his socialistic achievements in the last century and a half. There can be little doubt that man's social conscience has been aroused and the care of his fellow men is becoming the most serious consideration of more and more people. It may sound paradoxical to make this statement in the middle of a series of world wars and yet, perverted as it may be, the objects of the war as enunciated by both sides is the betterment of mankind. War is a foolish and regressive way to do this, but that this would seem to be the genuine object of at least some of the protagonists on both sides, according to their lights, is evidently true.

Even in time of war, social activities have gone on and many services were actually doing more work than they did before, especially in the most important field of all, the welfare of children and much time and money has been spent, in spite of the requirements of the war machine. Moreover, in spite of the very plausible argument of those who say that we ought to have devoted all our energies during the war to getting on with it and to think of first things first, it was found impossible to suppress the desire of very many people in all walks of life to think about and discuss plans for promoting better social services after the war, better educational services, better health services and better living conditions, for the people as a whole. The enormous interest and enthusiasm aroused by the Beveridge plan and the new educational programme show how deep-seated this feeling has been. That there is great promise for the future in this there can be no doubt, for in all this planning there is a constant note of "what is the best service that can be given?" not "how can I make most money or achieve greatest power?" How far these idealistic schemes will work out in practice remains to be seen, and it may be that, as happened after the last war, when the acid test of implementation is applied, the old rush for self will resume its sway and greed and selfishness will again achieve ascendancy. Nevertheless, in spite of all the disappointments of the early twenties, during the uneasy period of suspended hostilities, a very great deal of social betterment was achieved, housing reform, health reform, preservation of beauty and increase of knowledge—and so the picture may not have been quite so black as it has sometimes been painted. If so, then our opportunities for the betterment of the individual soul are slowly increasing.

From the broadest point of view we can get some idea of the state of individual souls in the mass from a study of the political history of the countries to which they belong. This gives us some insight into the really important problem of how far can man alter himself. Can he live up to the philosophy of life which he has set before himself, can he change the old Adam and if change takes place is it in the direction of generosity or greed? That he can change himself, and that rapidly, can be seen by how the Russian community changed itself in the space of one genera-

tion, between two wars. It has been the marvel of the world, how this apparently corrupt, ignorant and totally inefficient race has become disciplined, courageous and effective and, although the proof of these qualities has been in war, they cannot thereby be supposed to be absent in peace. It is true enough that war calls out certain qualities of national cohesion and endurance, but in other respects it is the hardest test of all and a nation that has proved itself so well in war is not likely to fail entirely in the more productive problems of peace.

Unfortunately, side by side with the apparent rise of a nation, we have witnessed in the same period of time the apparent decay of a nation. Owing to the corruption, selfishness and greed of her politicians, France fell and fell mightily in war and we know had deteriorated in peace more than we cared to think, but does this represent the real decay of a nation, or the failure to choose good leaders? All responsibility cannot be taken from the nation, for there is a good deal of truth in the saying that a nation deserves the government it gets; but many think that the spirit of the great French nation still lives and that it only slept temporarily, while rogues who were actuated entirely by greed and selfishness took advantage of that sleep to attain both money and power for their selfish ends. It remains to be seen, therefore, how these two great nations will shape themselves in the reconstruction period after the war.

The Collective Influence of Man

There is no doubt whatever that man can alter himself both collectively and individually, by making up his mind and setting out to effect that alteration, however much his actions may be based on primitive instinctive responses. Individually he may still be the straw driven by the wind of circumstances acting on his inherent impulses, but he can at least see an end towards which he might strive and is beginning to have a little power to propel himself along that path. In other words, he has got some power to make or mar his own soul, as the scriptures taught us.

Man is not significant only in what he gives to the environment, but also by reason of what he receives, for his behaviour and personality will be modified by what happens to him and there is no action without reaction. Here then is another component of that whole, which is the soul, namely the action of the environment on man's body and mind. Although man is to a large extent master of his own fortune, more, as has been pointed out, than he is inclined to admit, he is not entirely so. He is still to some extent the butt for "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune." He may meet with an accident, he may succumb to disease, he may lose a loved one in tragic and unforeseen circumstances or others may steal his fortune. All these things must make a difference to the whole man and so to his soul. How he reacts to these and other such misfortunes marks the quality and value of his soul and may, indeed, afford him an opportunity to raise the value of that soul. This opportunity he may take with both hands or he may reject it in bitterness and despair.

An even more stringent test for his soul may be good fortune, the devoted love of a good parent or mate, the sudden acquisition of riches or the enjoyment of radiant health. Will he use these for self-advancement or for race betterment? That is the crucial question.

And so at any given moment we can watch man going hither and thither and perhaps being driven here and there, but to estimate the whole man we must watch him, not at this moment or at that, but throughout his whole life history. Moreover, we cannot estimate his value by observing him in isolation, either in time or space, we must look at him in relation to his environment as a whole, for the whole term of his life, and through the whole span of his contacts with his surroundings. Only so can we view the whole man. As Whitehead insists:

“Things are never entirely external to one another, but interpenetrative. A thing does not exist only where it seems to be, it is wherever it acts.”¹

This may be better understood if we remember that the theory of relativity treats every particle of matter, not as a compact entity located exclusively in one tiny region of space, but as a geometrical modification of space-time, centred in one small region yet pervading the whole universe, though in diminishing degrees as we recede from that centre. If this applies to what we are accustomed to describe as physical things, still more does it apply to mental and spiritual things.

The Soul of Man

This, then is our conception of the soul of man: the sum total of the influences of his heredity, of his bodily construction, of his mental attitudes, of his knowledge, his feelings and his will, of his behaviour, of how his environment has reacted on him and what he has contributed to his environment from the centre in space and time where he is, radiating out through the universe, not only at one moment, but all through time from the moment of his birth. Nor does the influence of this sum total of the man cease with the moment of death, for it goes on radiating and extending through all time, just as it radiates through all space. As John Donne says “he is not an Ilande . . . his bell tolls for all.” It is not, however, the material influence which this whole man exerts which is significant, it is that which is outside space-time, its value in relation to the progress of humanity towards Deity. It is that value of the whole man which is his soul.

¹ A. N. Whitehead: *Science and the Modern World*.

IMMORTAL LIFE

The Immortality of the Individual Personal Soul

This soul, then, is not a part of, but is the whole man in the fullest sense of the word, and being the whole man is intensely personal and individual, but neither spatial nor temporal. It is his very person, his whole person, and being such is essentially himself; it can belong to no one else, though it can and does interact with everyone else at least to some minute extent, and pervades all humanity. Moreover, this individual personal soul is immortal.

“Can Shakespeare be said to have been truly born till many a long year after he had been reported as truly dead? While he was in the flesh was he more than a mere embryo growing towards birth into that life of the world to come, in which he now shines so gloriously?”¹

Nothing, no one, can destroy that significant value, which irradiates through time. We cannot get away from the fact that A influences the behaviour of B, B alters the behaviour of C, but C’s behaviour now owes something to both A and B and so does that of D and E and F and so on to all posterity.

“What happy bonds unite you, ye living and dead, your fadeless love-bloom, your manifold memories.”²

Personal Loss

We all grieve for the loss of the dead, even those who believe in a personal resurrection and a bodily reunion. Let us consider one of our typical losses. A daughter loses her dearly beloved father; she is inconsolable, he is no longer there to cherish her and fuss over her, he is no longer there, the steadfast rock to whom she could always return, sure of comfort, sure of understanding, sure of good advice. Angry sometimes, perhaps, but never for long and then the joy of reconciliation. The companionship, the planning of next year’s garden crops, the walks on the summer evenings, the cosy chats by the winter’s firesides. No, it is true there will be no more of that, the body, the physical presence, has gone, but has everything gone? No, a thousand times no. Has all his love, his kindness, the play of his mind upon hers, his advice, his comfort, all the intellectual and affective contributions to her personality, has it meant nothing, does it mean nothing, will it mean nothing? Of course

¹ S. Butler: *Erewhon Revisited*, xi.

² Andre Chenier.

it does and will, all that part of him remains, and it is his, the very him, individual, ever present, immortal. Will none of that make any difference to her behaviour to her bereaved mother, to her younger brothers and sisters, to her lover, to her husband and children, to her friends? Of course it will, she can never be the same as she would have been without him and no one with whom she comes in contact can ever be the same as they would have been without her, and he is part of her, his soul is part of her soul, and so his soul influences all the world through her, through those who are influenced by her and so on through an ever-widening circle. He can never die and that small significant value remains himself, indistinguishable, perhaps, in the outer seas of contact, but still himself.

"They that love beyond the world cannot be separated by it. Death cannot kill what never dies; this is the comfort of friends that though they may be said to die, yet their friendship and society are, in the best sense, ever present because immortal."¹

The same applies to the loss of the mother by the devoted son, of children by parents, of one partner in a happy marriage, of any relation or friend. The emotions attendant on such losses have been sung by the poets and recounted in the literature of all ages as far back as recorded poetry goes, though too seldom has enough stress been laid on what remains behind. Still even as far back as 300 B.C. we have:

"They told me, Heraclitus, they told me you were dead,
They brought me bitter news to hear and bitter tears to shed.
I wept as I remembered how often you and I
Had tired the sun with talking and sent him down the sky.
And now that thou art lying, my dear old Corian guest,
A handful of grey ashes, long, long ago at rest,
Still are thy pleasant voices, thy nightingales, awake.
For Death who taketh all, but them he cannot take."²

All these losses obey the same principle, the material part is mortal, but the value of the soul of the departed can never be lost.

"Their bodies are buried in peace,
But their name liveth for evermore."³

Common experience of nightingales or of any other joys last on and they are his nightingales, they are part of him.

The positive value of any soul will always be enhanced by love and its negative value by hate. Love enriches the living, but it also enriches the dead.

"All we know is, that even the humblest dead may live long after all trace of the body has disappeared; we see them doing it in the bodies and memories of those that come after them. . . . It is love alone that gives life, and the truest life is that which we live, not in

¹ William Penn: *Fruits of Solitude*.

² Callimachus (trans. William Cory).

³ Ecclesiasticus XLIV, II, 10.

ourselves, but vicariously in others and with which we have no concern. Our concern is so to order ourselves, that we may be of the number of them that enter into life—although we know it not.”¹

The Immortality of Love

But love for the individual is only part of love. We have envisaged in this book love spreading beyond the one to the many, but love of the many is service to the community. This too leaves an awareness of the soul, which was recognized as long ago as the days of Pericles.

“And each one having given his body to the commonwealth, they receive instead thereof a most remarkable sepulchre, not that wherein they are buried, so much as that other, wherein their glory is laid up on all occasions both of word and deed to be remembered evermore. For to famous men all the earth is a sepulchre: and their virtues shall be testified, not only by the inscription on stone at home, but in all lands whatsoever, in the unwritten record of the mind, which, far beyond any monument, will remain with all men everlastingly.”²

A man may or may not hand on his characteristics to children by physical inheritance, but that, important as it may be, pales into insignificance compared to what he hands on to generations yet unborn by social heritage. Though to most of us it may seem that our contribution to the behaviour, the knowledge, the feelings, of someone a hundred generations hence may be infinitely small, yet who is to know for certain? Many are the fresh discoveries in knowledge which have been stimulated by a half-forgotten hint of something said or done by someone quite unknown. Attention has already been drawn to the influence of what might be regarded as insignificant home-making on a great man, and probably the first person to deny that she had any part in that great man's contribution to humanity would be the woman who made that home. On what are founded the inspirations of great art or great social reforms? How often does the little beget the great? To some it is given greatly to contribute to our social heritage by their work, Æschylus, Dante, Shakespeare; Phidias, Michael Angelo, Leonardo; Bach, Beethoven, Brahms; and these we call the great men of history. These great men no doubt contribute greatly.

“He (Nelson) has left us, not indeed his mantle of inspiration, but a name and an example, which at this hour are inspiring thousands of the youth of England. A name which is our pride, and an example which will continue to be our shield and our strength. Thus it is that the spirits of the great and wise continue to live and to act after them, verifying, in this sense, the language of the old mythologist:

‘For Gods they are, through Jove’s counsels good,
Haunting the earth, the guardians of mankind.’”³

¹ S. Butler: *Ramblings in Cheapside*.

² Thucydides: *History* II, 37 (Funeral Oration of Pericles).

³ R. Southey: *Life of Nelson*.

Shakespeare was right when he wrote:

“So long as men can breathe, or eyes can see,
So long lives this, and this gives life to thee.”¹

But the little man can have faith that his soul has immortality too, and that, for all he can tell, that soul of his may produce results, not necessarily here and now. By some obscure and devious path, the little idea, the little feeling, the little impulse of his will, born of him and of him alone, or the little kindness or unkindness done by him, has travelled down the silent paths of time and at last germinated, through the interaction of many other human souls, and grown to produce something really great.

“These never faded and fell and crumbled in human memories like the others, but entered the human tradition and live for evermore, in however transformed a shape, in myth and folklore and religion, subtle inspiring influences of which the originating persons have been in name forgotten, and yet they live on for ever in the life of the world—tiny, indistinguishable rays in the great flame of life.”²

The Value of Immortality

What matters is the value of our individual, immortal souls. Just how far have these life histories of ours—not the individual acts or the momentary feelings, good or bad—but our whole lives promoted or retarded the march of humanity towards Deity. If on the whole we have hindered, then our souls are bad, but if we have on balance advanced humanity then surely our souls are good. We may take comfort that if, as we have tried to show in this book, in spite of backslidings, in spite of wars, in spite of years when greed and selfishness and pride have held sway, there is a regular progress with an ever-growing velocity towards Deity, then it means that the vast majority of men’s souls are good on the whole and are working towards and not away from the quality of Deity. And so in individual lives, in spite of incidents, when self-preservation has been all-powerful, there have also been incidents in all our lives, when race-preservation has truly directed us and, in view of the established fact of general progress, the race-preservation incidents must have on balance predominated, though perhaps not yet by very much.

Now that man is able, as probably never before in history, to alter himself, may we not hope that he will succeed in increasing the strength of these impulses by his own endeavour both in himself and in others. If so he will succeed in increasing the significance and value of the souls of the whole human race. Further may we not come to realize that the wish for individual personal survival and even the hope of reunion with our loved ones do really belong to our self-preservation, to our selfish impulses? For many of us it may well prove the most difficult task to abandon this particular piece of wishful thinking, but we must

¹ W. Shakespeare: *Sonnets*.

² Havelock Ellis: *Impressions and Comments*.

realize that these wishes and hopes are basically for our own advantage and to gratify our own personal wishes and ambitions.

"If we are to follow the clue of experience, we must therefore believe that, theoretically, the claim for the future life is founded on error. We must content ourselves with the continuance of species rather than of persons, and I must add that, to me at least, this limitation of desire seems only to be imposed on us by such knowledge as we have, but it is practically a higher object of desire. And if mere continuance of human ideals does not satisfy us, for nature may involve the physical destruction of mind, there is the other and higher satisfaction of thinking that the persistence of our human effort in tradition is doing the work of preparing Deity, according to the well-justified phrase, *in God's good time* and, it must be added, *place*."¹

Death not an Irretrievable Loss

When we give way to grief for the loss of a loved one, how often are we thinking of him and how often of ourselves. It is our loss we grieve for. War has taught us that no man is absolutely essential to the common weal, the best seem to die and yet others come forward to take their places and the general scheme of things goes on, probably not very differently in spite of the loss. We do not find it any too easy to rejoice that the dead man or woman has been released from a painful illness or a life of poverty and worry and sometimes, though, of course, by no means always or even often, our grief may be tinged by regret for lost position or for lost wealth. It is a hard task but we must learn to count our blessings even in the face of death. We must try to forget our grief at the loss of the dead person's bodily presence, we must think how much the influence, the soul of the dear departed, can help us to promote the happiness of others, and the more will this influence be, the more he has loved us and the more we have loved him. We must try always to remember that it is not the individual who matters but the community. Plato in the *Timæus* accepts the principle that the spiritual principle of the universe is indestructible, but that individual souls are not necessarily immortal. This according to Temple² is the doctrine of the New Testament and he points out that resurrection is not necessarily synonymous with immortality or continued existence after life. What survives may in fact be that which is significant for the spiritual principle of the universe, while that which is not significant may be eternally destroyed, i.e. destroyed once for all, not eternally punished. Again it comes round to what has so often been said before, self-preservation must give place to race-preservation, greed and selfishness to generosity and kindliness.

The Advance to Deity

If we can achieve this attitude of mind, will not the furtherance of the progress of the race as a whole be sufficient incentive, by which to mould

¹ S. Alexander: *Space, Time and Deity*, II, 424.

² W. Temple: *Nature, Man and God*, p. 463.

our lives? Will not this advance to Deity, however far away may be the goal, be so tremendously worth striving for, that there can be no question, but that that must be our object, and that to achieve it we shall be prepared to work with all our might?

“Fair fame after death is a truer consolation to the dying, a truer comfort to surviving friends and a more real incentive to good conduct in this life.”¹

Actually we are doing that now to some extent intuitively, in virtue of these impulses which we have discussed before, the impulse to work, to do something, to refuse to sit in idleness and apathy, and the impulse of reverence, of respect and enthusiasm for something higher and better and beyond ourselves, the impulse which leads us away from selfishness and greed and pride, to the brighter prospects of honesty, generosity, dignity and kindliness. Even now we may believe that:

“Death hath this also, that it openeth the gate to good fame and extinguisheth envy.”²

When these impulses rise to the full level of conscious endeavour we may look forward to a tremendous advance of humanity to the realization of Truth, Beauty and Goodness, to that state of Harmony and Happiness, when humanity shall at last be Deity. Let us not forget that in that progress, the individual, immortal soul of each one of us will have played its part and perhaps a more significant part than any of us have dared to hope. Those that have gone before will have helped those that came after and must continue to do so right down through the ages. Nothing that is worth while in humanity can ever be lost or pass away and, when humanity has reached Deity, will not the souls of all have found fulfilment and be joined in a full and complete reunion?

¹ S. Butler: *Erewhon Revisited*, XII.

² Francis Bacon: *Essays of Death*.

INDEX OF AUTHORS

A

Adler, A., 161
 Alexander, S., 77, 83, 154, 180, 198
 Amill, H. F., 49, 50, 70
 Anon., 33
 Aristotle, 21, 59, 68, 78, 83
 Arnold, M., 173

B

Bacon, F., 50, 51, 199
 Bax, E. B., 103
 Benson, A. C., 57, 69
 Berkeley, Bishop G., 128
 Blake, W., 23, 24, 73, 156
 Bridges, R., 11, 28, 38, 49, 54, 55, 56, 66,
 76, 77, 123, 132, 140, 168
 Browning, R., 180
 Buchan, J., 165, 178
 Buckle, H. T., 89, 120, 132
 Buckmaster, Lord, 116
 Buddha, 121
 Burnet, Gilbert, 137
 Bury, J. B., 77
 Butler, S., 81, 116, 180, 194, 196, 199

C

Callimachus, 195
 Carlyle, T., 20, 44, 64, 136, 168, 179
 Carrel, A., 81, 85
 Cavell, Nurse, 57
 Cervantes, 74
 Chateaubriand, 77
 Chenier, A., 118, 161, 194
 Childe, G., 13, 52
 Churchill, W., 174
 Comte, A., 33, 35, 60, 72, 91
 Confucius, 21
 Cowley, A., 58

D

Dante, 37, 71, 74, 167
 Democratus, 47, 76
 Descartes, R., 128
 Donne, J., 73, 184, 185, 193
 Dostoevski, A., 41, 136

E

Ecclesiastes, 50
 Ecclesiasticus, 120, 147, 174, 195
 Einstein, A., 48
 Eliot, G., 135
 Ellis, Havelock, 89, 94, 172, 183, 197
 Esdras, 48, 188

F

Field, G. C., 69, 168
 Flecker, J. E., 20
 Friedman, W., 168
 Freud, S., 136
 Froude, J., 15, 36, 57, 59

G

Galsworthy, J., 93
 Gandhi, 121
 Goethe, W., 22
 Gordon, R. G., 11
 Gorki, M., 77
 Gray, J. L., 52, 66, 174

H

Haldane, J. B. S., 157
 Herbert of Chisbury, Lord, 131
 Hobbes, T., 93
 Hone, W., 49
 Hooker, R., 167
 Hume, D., 78, 128
 Huxley, J., 131, 135, 139, 154

J

James, W., 36
 Job, 138
 Jung, C. J., 145

K

Keats, J., 9, 10, 53, 63
 Kékulé, A., 63
 Kropotkin, Prinz P., 91, 92, 93, 140, 165

L

Lashley, K., 182
 Lessing, 11
 Linklater, E., 29
 Lloyd Morgan, J., 157, 180, 181
 Locke, J., 79

M

McDougall, W., 31, 32, 133
 Malloch, W. H., 34, 86
 Marcus Aurelius, 157
 Mazzini, J., 26, 77, 94, 155
 Milton, J., 25, 35, 89
 More, Sir T., 99
 Murray, Gilbert, 134

N

Nettleship, R. L., 44
 Newton, Sir I., 48
 Nietzsche, F., 121, 154

P

Pater, W., 50
 Penn, W., 195
 Plato, 10, 51, 52, 53, 55, 167, 198
 Pliny, 102
 Plotinus, 57, 59, 60
 Powis, J. C., 50, 77
 Proverbs, 53, 66, 171

R

Rivarol, 20
 Ruskin, J., 54
 Russell, B., 40, 76, 88

S

Saint Jerome, 151
 Saint John, 23, 28, 73, 144
 Saint Paul, 73, 104, 149
 Saint Peter, 57
 Sallustius, 68, 155
 Samuel, Lord, 14, 86, 103, 157
 Sankey, Lord, 23, 35
 Shakespeare, W., 21, 40, 65, 132, 147, 179,
 197
 Shand, A., 31
 Shelley, P. B., 11, 34, 55, 132
 Smuts, J., 74, 140, 173, 175, 180
 Solovov, V., 71
 Southey, R., 196
 Spinoza, 31, 128, 135
 Sterne, L., 185
 Stevenson, R. L., 23
 Swinburne, A. C., 131

T

Temple, W., 14, 46, 47, 61, 78, 104, 130,
 138, 144, 161, 162, 198
 Thucydides, 196
 Tolstoi, L., 28, 177
 Tse, 21

W

Wells, H. G., 82, 99, 101
 Whitehead, A. N., 53, 172, 193
 Wilson, Canon, 161
 Wood Jones, F., 123
 Wordsworth, W., 57

Y

Yeardsley, M., 23
 Yellowlees, D., 48
 Young, J. C., 121

INDEX

A

Abortion, 106
 Abstractions, 81
 Activity, 39
 Adjustment to life, 65
 AEsthetics, 96
 Affect, 19, 30
 Aggression, 165
 Agnosticism, 80, 131
 Alphabet, 98
 Altruism, 39, 166
 Ammonites, 159
 Amoeba, 182
 Ante-natal care, 106
 Appetites, 71
 Aristocracy, 177
 Atheism, 80
 Atheist, 131
 Atlantic Charter, 94
 Atoms, 124
 Autocracy, 102
 Autonomic nervous system, 30
 Awe, 134, 166

B

Baal, Priests of, 143
 Baptism, 149
 Beauty, 10, 47, 156
 Beauty and fitness, 53
 Beauty and love, 55
 Behaviour, 57
 Beveridge plan, 105, 191
 Binocular vision, 97
 Birth control, 106
 Birth rate, 94
 Blind, Schools for, 110
 Body, 11
 Body-mind relationship, 17
 Brain, 15, 182
 Brain and mind, 128
 Breed (sex), 140
 British Broadcasting Corporation, 56, 117
 Bronze, 98
 Brotherly love, 146
 Buddhism, 22, 35
 Burying beetles, 91

C

Capitalism, 34
 Catholic dogma, 103
 Cause and effect, Laws of, 126
 Cave drawings, 98
 Celibacy, 73, 148
 Certification of lunacy, 115
 Chaos, 83, 154, 158
 Chemistry, 124
 Child guidance, 116
 Choice, 41
 Chosen people, 142
 Christianity, 22, 137, 146
 Chromosomes, 12
 Church, 149
 Cinematograph, 56
 Cognition, 19
 Comfort, 188
 Commandments, The great, 28
 Communism, 34
 Community love, 148
 Conation, 19, 38
 Conflict, 32, 42, 45
 Constantine, Emperor, 146
 Courts of justice, 116
 Crèches, 108
 Cruelty, 165
 Cuneiform script, 98

D

Deaf, Schools for, 110
 Death, 198
 Deity, 29, 46, 78, 140, 149, 154, 156, 168, 175, 199
 Democracy, 181
 Deuterium, 181
 Devil, 150, 154
 Dinosaurs, 159
 Divine revelation, 173
 Doctrine, 149
 Dominant sentiment, 32, 36

E

Ecology, 186
 Ecstasy, 70
 Education, 108
 Einsteinian physics, 67

Electricity, 100
 Elizabethan intelligence, 52
 Emergence, 180
 Emergent evolution, 180
 Employment insurance, 113
 Endeavour, 35
 Endocrine glands, 16, 30, 183
 Energy, 124, 125
 Enterprise, 120
 Entropy, 89, 131, 157
 Epilepsy, 110
 Ethics, 69, 96
 Eugenics, 87, 105, 121
 Evil, 81, 138, 154, 162
 Evolution, 84
 Experience, 40

Faith, 83
 Father, 136, 145
 Fear, 142
 Fire, 97
 First person of the Trinity, 151
 Fitness and Beauty, 53
 Foresight, 40, 184
 Form, 124
 Fourth dimensional presentation, 68
 Free thought, 24
 Free will, 24, 160, 163, 168
 French Revolution, 100
 Frustration, 43
 Führer, 165

G

Genes, 12
 Germans, 165
 Germ plasm, 12, 86
 Giant reptiles, 84
 God, 20, 34, 78, 82, 141, 142
 God of love, 144
 Golden Age, 51
 Goodness, 47, 57, 60, 69
 Gospels, 144
 Gramophones, 56
 Greed, 143, 165
 Greek culture, 52
 Gregarious animal, 39
 Gregariousness, 90
 Guilt feelings, 72
 Gunpowder, 99

H

Handicapped children, 109
 Happiness, 46, 47, 76
 Harmony, 70, 74, 83, 154
 Health, 59, 189
 Heavy water, 181
 Herd instinct, 90, 165
 Hereditary disease, 105
 Heredity, 12, 14
 Herrenvolk, 165
 Holism, 180
 Home making, 190, 196
Homo sapiens, 85
 Hospital services, 112
 Housewife, 190, 196
 Humanity, 169, 199
 Human selection, 85
 Hunger, 71

I

Imbecile, 135
 Immaterial universe, 124
 Immortality, 194, 197
 Impulses, 45
 Impulse to do the Will of God, 45
 Individual liberty, 103
 Industrial medicine, 112
 Infectious diseases, 111
 Infinity, 79, 165
 Instincts, 30, 39
 Intelligence, 51
 Intelligence, Measurement of, 62
 Interstellar space, 126
 Intervient Deity, 158
 Intuition, 63, 156
 Iron, 98
 Isis, 142, 145

J

James-Lange theory, 38
 Japanese, 165
 Jealousy, 73
 Jehovah, 138, 143, 144
 Jesus, 144
 Jewish belief, 136
 Jewish God, 142
 Jove, 144
 Judgment, 40
 Juvenile Courts, 116

K

Kings, 24, 143
Kindliness, 172
Knowledge, 49

L

Laws of Moses, 143
Leader, 23, 177, 179
Leadership, 27
Lebensraum, 165
Leisure, 51, 58, 117, 119, 189
Libraries, 117
Life, 122, 181
Long life, 85
Love, 55, 60, 136, 140, 144, 196
Love of God, 47
Loyalty, 171
Luxury, 188

M

Malaria, 160, 186
Manual dexterity, 16
Married love, 147
Materialism, 123, 124
Material success, 44
Maternity and child welfare service, 107
Maternity service, 107
Mathematical formulæ, 127
Matter, 124
Medical profession, 58
Memory, 183
Mental deficiency, 67, 105, 115
Mental health, 114
Mental illness, 66
Messiah, 143
Metallurgy, 100
Metal tools, 98
Metaphysics, 124
Microbes, 84
Middle Ages, 103
Mind, 11, 18, 128, 181
Mind and matter, 127, 128
Miracles, 126
Missionaries, 172
Modern art, 65
Mahomedanism, 22
Molucca crabs, 91
Mother, 145
Museums, 117
Mutations, 13, 159
Mutual aid, 91
Mystics, 50

N

National health service, 112
National Trust, 117
Natural laws, 126
Natural piety, 156
Natural selection, 84, 159
Nebulæ, 158
Nervous breakdown, 26, 32
Noblesse oblige, 177
Nursery schools, 108, 109

O

Œdipus complex, 136
Old age, 114
Orthopaedic clinics, 110
Osiris, 142, 145

P

Pagan god, 142
Panis et circenses, 118
Paper, 99
Papyrus, 98
Particles, 127
Patriotism, 57
Penology, 116
Pentateuch, 143
Perfect man, 122
Personality, 11
Personal survival, 150
Philosophy, 95
Philosophy of life, 20, 26
Physics, 124
Picture galleries, 117
Pity, 121
Plague, 187
Plan, 20
Planning, 191
Plasmodium of malaria, 160
Platypus, 170
Politics, 175
Power, 21, 165
Pragmatism, 61
Precision instruments, 49
Priests, 24, 142
Printing, 99
Process, 130
Progress of the universe, 89
Prophets, 137, 173
Providence, 43
Psycho-analysts, 183
Psychology, 19

Public utilities, 117
Punishment, 102

Q

Quality of Deity, 47

R

Reason, 63
Reciprocity, 23, 33, 39, 57
Reformers, 171
Regression, 170
Relativity, 193
Religion, 20, 140
Religious cruelty, 166
Renaissance, 95, 169
Repression, 183
Reptiles, Giant, 84, 159
Research, 109
Response, 39
Resurrection, 194
Reverence, 131, 134, 161
Rheumatism, 110
Rome, 170
Russian Revolution, 104

S

Saint, 58, 76
Scepticism, 78
School medical service, 108
Science, 49, 123
Secondary schools, 109
Second Person of the Trinity, 153
Selection, 178
Selective breeding, 121, 160
Self assertion, 93
Self regard, 32
Self seeking, 143
Sentiment of the love of God, 33, 44, 55
Sentiments, 31, 185
Sex, 71, 72, 140
Sex determination, 12
Significance, 63
Sister, 147
Social conscience, 191
Social heritage, 13, 86, 196
Social services, 105
Social Service Committees, 114
Solitary animals, 91
Soul, 9, 180, 193
Space-time, 124, 125, 129

INDEX

Speech, 15, 97
Spiritualism, 17, 82
Spiritual progress, 130
Spiritual success, 44
Stability, 68
Star in the East, 131
Sterilization, 105
Stupidity, 51
Success, 42, 44, 46
Superman, 122
Syphilis, 186

T

Telepathy, 18
Tests of intelligence, 62
Things, 124, 130
Third person of the Trinity, 152
Tolerance, 172
Tools, 90, 97
Trades Unions, 113
Trinity, 151
Tropisms, 30
Truth, 47, 48
Truth as feeling, 53
Tuberculosis, 111

U

Universe, 50, 156, 157
Unselfishness, 57
Uprightness, 57

V

Values, 131
Variations, 13
Venereal diseases, 111
Virgin Mary, 145
Voluntary Social Service, 111, 118

W

War, 93
Waves, 127
Wedded love, 147
Wicked men, 138
Will, 38, 41, 46
Will of God, 47
Wisdom, 49, 174
Withdrawal, 35
Women workers, 109
Writing, 98

Z

Zest, 120, 161
Zeus, 144

DATE OF ISSUE

This book must be returned
within 3, 7, 14 days of its issue. A
fine of ONE ANNA per day will
be charged if the book is overdue.

Class No...124...

Book No 665P

Vol.

Author.....G. Z. Dan.....

Title *Philosophy of a Scientist*....

Acc. No. 38179

8 Fe '53 6277

13 AG

5.12.12/5

12 Fe '58 A156

12 Mar 68

1722

24 Mar

1765

11/8/72

R. K. Kaul